THE CAUSE OF WORLD UNREST

With an Introduction by
THE EDITOR OF
"THE MORNING POST"
(OF LONDON)

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
The Knickerbocker Press
1920
DW

COPYRIGHT, 1920,
BY
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

On the ground of its intrinsic historic importance, and of the widespread interest it has attracted on the other side of the Atlantic, there seems to be good warrant for the publication of an American edition of *The Cause of the World's Unrest.*

The American publishers desire to make clear, however, that they do not accept responsibility for the soundness of the conclusions presented in this volume. They have issued the book because of their belief that the American reading public should be afforded an opportunity of examining the material.

It is the contention of the author that certain of the plans for domination outlined in the documents upon which his volume is based have apparently been followed in the recent movements in Russia.

The publishers desire to point out, what the author of the volume has himself emphasized, that, while the statements presented *do* reflect upon the purpose and the actions of certain groups of Jews,

and of certain groups of Freemasons, there has been no intention of bringing accusation against the Jewish race as a whole, or against the Freemasons as a society.

NEW YORK, Sept. 20, 1920.

There have been innumerable occasions when the loyalty of a new citizen to his new State has been admirable: on the other hand, both here and in America, we have found that race instincts have been stronger than oaths of allegiance.

But in the case of the Jews, we find a people which has preserved both its religious and its racial ideals intact through many generations of cruel persecution. A race which has persisted in spite of such terrific pressure, constantly applied and often without mercy or justice, must be acknowledged to be a great and virile nationality in the mere fact of its persistence. But when we consider that this race has not merely persisted, but has achieved enormous power and influence in every civilized country, our admiration is easily aroused. Yet there is another side to the picture. How are you to regard these strangers in your midst? Are they Americans, Jewish Americans, or American Jews? The answer to this question is the solution of the Jewish problem.

Jews will, however, reply with assurance that they are not a race but a religion and that to differentiate between them and other religious bodies

is sheer prejudice and bald Anti-Semitism. In some cases this claim is justified. There are in England Jewish families which have lived here for centuries and their devotion to their country is beyond question. It is necessary to distinguish, therefore, between those Jews who have definitely adopted a single nationality and those to whom the Jewish nationality is the only one that counts. How is one to distinguish? There again lies another great problem in this greater problem of Jewry in the world. Roughly speaking, the only way to mark out a line which would separate the good Jewish citizen from the bad Jewish citizen is to apply the political test. As a rule, though it is not without exceptions, a Jew who is politically active in a country is also racially active. But there are, of course, many Jews who are indifferent to the politics of the country in which they live and yet are ardent Jewish nationalists. In a word, because the Jews can and do possess a dual nationality, they must remain suspect from the point of view of the man who acknowledges exclusive allegiance to a single country. This suspicion, which seems to me to be natural and by no means exaggerated, goes by the name of Anti-Semitism.

PREFACE TO AMERICAN EDITION

Are the great mass of Jews working towards a definite goal or are they mere ordinary citizens against whom envy, suspicion, and long-dated religious animosity have provoked an unfair prejudice? The answer to this question will be found in this book. Lately there has been published both in America and England a translation of a work entitled "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion." It is difficult to say whether or not it is a genuine document. I am quite sure that, if it had been published in these countries ten years ago, it would have been received with incredulity and, perhaps, contempt. But today, after our experience of the War, the Peace Conference, and the doings of the Jews in Russia, it has received everywhere a great deal of earnest study and consideration. Many of its prophecies are being fulfilled before our eyes and, because of this, we are justified in giving to it a greater credence than could have been possible ten years ago. Jewish writers and newspapers have denied with indignation the authenticity of the protocols. But even if indisputable proof were adduced tomorrow that they are a forgery, there would still be asked the same question which the protocols have provoked and are provoking every day. Have the Jews

a foreign policy of their own with a definite end in view?

It would be difficult to deny to that section of Jewry which is best described as political, a definite national policy. There is nothing inherently wrong or improper in this. All that we Gentiles ask is that acknowledgment should be made that such is the case. When that is made clear, we can then judge whether or not such policy is to our advantage and we can act accordingly. Yet many Jews attempt to deny that they have any political ambitions apart from the interests of the country in which they live. This denial can carry no weight, as the reader will acknowledge after reading these pages. And it becomes incumbent upon us therefore to study the nature and scope of this Jewish policy in order to see how far it is compatible with our own national policies. This book is an attempt to give an outline of the political aims and objectives of political Jewry. But a word of warning is necessary. Political Jewry does not comprise all Jewry. There are many Jewish citizens both in America and here who differ from the rest of us only in their religion. A blind Anti-Semitism directed against all Jews is both bad policy and an act of injustice to Jewry.

But while we must be just, we must also be firm in our determination not to allow a duality of national policy in one and the same citizen.

H. A. GWYNNE,
Editor *The Morning Post*,
London.

SEPTEMBER, 1920.

INTRODUCTION

THOSE who have studied their history must at times have been astonished at the ease with which popular movements, honest and sincere in themselves, have been manipulated by clever and unscrupulous men to their own personal advantage or to further their own political aspirations. The people have throughout the ages presented a pathetic spectacle. Time and again they have been used with most barefaced effrontery as a means of producing results which they themselves never desired. Indeed, in many cases, they have suffered terribly from their own achievements. Nothing is more pitiful than the persistent betrayal of the people by their leaders and nothing more splendid than the people's refusal to believe it. In earlier history popular movements were difficult to create and direct unless they were purely local. Kings, princes, governors stood between the masses and their exploiters. Distances, too, were great in the days before railways,

and communication was difficult. But, roughly speaking, the people were prevented by established authority from being victimized. Today all that is changed, and we now live in an age which will be known, perhaps, in history as the age of the exploitation of the people.

This exploitation of the people has in later years become something of a fine art. The party machine, which was at first merely the instrument by which a party tried to impress its views on the electors, has in many cases taken charge of the party, so that this machine and not its leaders decides what shall or what shall not form part of the programme. Battle cries, "slogans," phrases, and catchwords, deliberately framed so that they should conceal the truth or create a false impression have now become part of nearly every political campaign. Do our politicians ever ponder over this surprising fact, that the greatest response to a semi-political appeal that England has ever seen took place in 1914–15, when the call was to go out to *death?* And they have so little knowledge of the people they govern that they are surprised when the most tempting of battle cries, telling the people how much they can have for the mere asking, remain without result. The explanation of

this is simple enough and yet it is far too high for the understanding of the mere politician. It consists in this truth, that the people of this country can only be really roused by an appeal to their better nature. That is the strength of England.

We are seeing today how the exploitation of the people can be achieved with comparative ease because the people throughout the civilized world is enfranchised and there is no one to stand between the exploiters and the exploited. If we look back in history, we shall find that the disappearance of this intermediate influence has not been altogether fortuitous. There have been kings who exploited their people just as Lenin is today exploiting the Russian people, but they have mostly paid forfeit with their thrones, as Lenin one day will pay forfeit with his life. But the temptation to get at the people and to use them for ends to which they are indifferent and of which they are ignorant has been great. The pages of this book will trace the threads of a conspiracy engineered by people whose main object has been to destroy utterly anything—kings, governments, or institutions—which might stand between them and the people they would exploit.

Many who read the story of this subterranean

scheming as it is unfolded in this book may perhaps be disinclined to admit the correctness of the author's statements because of the startling conclusions to which they lead up. But I would urge the reader to cast aside all prejudices and to judge the facts brought out on their merits as facts and to suggest, if he can, other conclusions. The main outline of the contents of this book is, in brief, that there has been for centuries a hidden conspiracy, chiefly Jewish, whose objects have been and are to produce revolution, communism, and anarchy, by means of which they hope to arrive at the hegemony of the world by establishing some sort of despotic rule.

The "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," an edition of which has been published in England, have aroused tremendous interest and a storm of protest. It will be noticed by the reader that the editors of the volume have taken particular care not to assume the authenticity of these protocols. They may or may not be genuine. Their present importance lies in the fact that, while the book which contains them was published in 1905, the Jewish Bolsheviks are today carrying out almost to the letter the programme outlined in the protocols.

I have said that this secret revolutionary move-

ment seems to have been engineered chiefly by Jews. It is about time that somebody spoke out frankly on this subject. I myself have several Jew friends. One of them I shall always remember with gratitude, for he would give me no peace in the years before the war until he had convinced me of the German danger. At his own expense he despatched a man to visit the various dockyards of Germany and the information thus obtained was found extremely useful. Now this man is as good a patriot as I am, but I say that there are certain bad Jews who have conspired and are conspiring against stable government; I point out that over 80 per cent. of the present Bolshevik Government are Jews, and that the Bolshevik movement outside Russia is chiefly directed by Jews.

If I cast doubt upon the political integrity of any Jew, or even if I disagree with his policy, I am dubbed an anti-Semite. This is not just. I accuse the Jews themselves of creating anti-Semitism and I will proceed to give my reasons.

The Jews are justly proud of their race, which, in spite of every sort of difficulty, has not only persisted throughout the ages, but has achieved a position of great power and influence in nearly every civilized country. Persecution and outside

pressure have taught them to stand together, and the tradition of unity is as strong, if not stronger, today. They may quarrel among themselves, but they unite instantly and almost unconsciously against any criticism from outside. The result is that a critic of a prominent individual Jew or of a particular Jewish policy, who begins with no sort of prejudice against Jewry, finds arrayed against him the serried and united ranks of Jewry. It is no use his declaring that his objections are not to Jewry, but to a particular Jew or a particular Jewish policy. He is dubbed an anti-Semite, with a consequence that he has to accept the epithet and, in some cases, on the principle of the dog with the bad name, promptly proceeds to justify it.

I will give a concrete instance of this. A few months ago, as a result of the Peace Conference, Great Britain accepted a mandate for Palestine, and, true to her word, proceeded to carry out her promise to provide a home for Jews in that country. At the present moment the population of Palestine consists of 80 per cent. Arabs and 20 per cent. Christians, Jews, and other religions. The Arabs are in a highly excited state of mind, because they know of the intention of the British Government to afford Jews a home in Palestine. Naturally they

are asking each other what is to become of them if the Jews come into their country in great numbers. They are not ignorant of the fact that there has been started a great Jewish fund of £25,000,000 to aid the immigration of Jews into their country. The situation is a highly delicate one. On the one hand is the declared British policy, on the other the Arab inhabitants, fearful about their fate. To deal with such a critical state of things tact and, above all, impartiality was required. The British Government for some extraordinary reason appointed Sir Herbert Samuel, a Jew, to be High Commissioner for Palestine. In the opinion of the *Morning Post* it was a dangerous and an improper appointment. Were Sir Herbert Samuel the greatest of men and a very Solomon for wisdom, the appointment would still be a gross mistake, for even the loftiest motives and the most impartial application of justice were bound to be misunderstood. I have never yet met in private conversation a Jew or a Christian who defended the appointment. Yet when the *Morning Post* protested against it, the Jewish papers came out with bitter attacks, and with the usual accusations of anti-Semitism. Cannot the good Jews see that this is a mistaken policy? It creates, as I said

before, anti-Semitism. The objection to Sir Herbert Samuel's appointment was justified on every count. If the British Government had proposed Sir Edward Carson as Viceroy of Ireland, that step would be exactly on all fours with the choice of a Jew as High Commissioner of Palestine. Surely criticism of such an obviously unwise decision might have passed without arousing the stupid cry of anti-Semitism.

The question which every reader of this book will want to have answered is whether there is a Jewish Peril and, if so, what are its ramifications. That there is a Jewish Peril I have no sort of doubt, but we must guard ourselves against generalizations. It is easy to prove that a certain section of the Jews in the world are engaged in a mighty attempt to destroy the established rule in many countries and to bring this world into communistic brotherhood. The thing is taking place before our eyes. But it would be downright wicked to ascribe to Jewry as a whole this mad and dangerous policy. In that direction lies the danger, the hideous danger of a violent and indiscriminate anti-Semitism. It must be averted by the Jews themselves. The honest, patriotic Jews must come forward and denounce and no longer

defend the revolutionaries of their race. They should refuse to approve of any policy which tends to undermine the pillars of civilized society, for the time has come when there can be no sitting on the fence; those who are not with us are against us.

The pages of this book will tell the tale of this conspiracy against civilization—for that is really what it amounts to. Perhaps I may be excused if I give a brief summary of the circumstances and the deductions irresistibly proceeding from them which brought one to the conclusion that the causes of the present world's unrest were not fortuitous but the result of a definite plan. When the war broke out, it seemed, and I believe it was, a simple, plain, straightforward struggle between a people whose pride in their warlike achievements had forced them along the direction of a world hegemony and the countries who refused to accept it. During the war it was impossible to shut one's eyes to the fact that a certain section of the Jews did not desire to see Germany vanquished. The "peace without victory" suggestion had many supporters in international circles where Jews had influence. Again, I must warn the reader that he must not accept this statement as a suggestion that Jewry throughout the war was pro-German.

But it is true that there was observable in certain Jewish circles a tenderness for Germany which we could not understand. Then came the Peace Conference in Paris, where this tenderness for Germany became more and more marked. The theory which prevailed at the Armistice that Germany had offended against humanity and therefore had to be punished, just as a man is hanged for murder, was displaced gradually by suggestions that leniency was the best policy. All that the ordinary man could make of it all was that Germany was getting off remarkably lightly.

Later on at the Conference we come to a phase in the proceeding where it is possible to say that Jewish influence did materially affect the policy of the Allies. I refer to Poland, and I do not make this assertion at random, but I base it on the speeches and statements of Jews themselves or Jewish newspapers.

The policy of the Allied and Associated Powers was avowedly the creation of a strong Poland. No country can be strong in these days of commerce and industry unless it has an outlet on the sea. Therefore, it was obvious from the first that Dantzig must be part of the newly constituted Poland. Again, no country can hope to remain strong unless

it has full powers of government over all its inhabitants within its boundaries. From the very outset it was obvious that there was going to be a desperate struggle in Paris to defeat all attempts to create a strong Poland. The Jews openly threw their influence on the anti-Polish side. The Jewish Delegation sat throughout the Conference and strained every nerve to deny Dantzig to the Poles and to create special privileges for the Jews in Poland. In this matter Jewish policy was in opposition to British policy. Our Foreign Office, which has been subjected to a most deliberate and subtle campaign of calumny, declared in Paris that Dantzig was the test of our policy, and that a free and strong Polish Government was essential in British interests. Here our interests and Jewish interests were at variance. We are entitled to ask what was the attitude of British Jews at this crisis. Were they British first and Jews afterwards, or Jews first—British afterwards? Is it a mere accident that at the moment I write the whole force of Bolshevism in this country is being organized to force our Government to allow Russia to occupy Warsaw?

All this time the Jewish Junta in Russia was working with feverish activity to extend its loath-

some propaganda in other countries. With the Armistice came two Bolshevist attempts in our country. Glasgow and Belfast tried to put into practice here the theories of Bolshevism. These attempts were dead failures, and it was obvious that Sovietism would not be carried by a *coup de main* in this country. So our enemies and the enemies of civilization, the Jew Bolsheviks, determined upon another plan. There was nothing secret in this. The substitution of a slower system of undermining civilization in this country was announced from the housetops, so to speak. Here are the Jew-Bolsheviks' orders to their sympathizers in this country:

> "If such elements (Bolsheviks and Spartacists) increase in numbers and strength, everything may get changed. At first it is necessary: (1) The centre of gravity of the struggle must be outside of Parliaments (strikes, revolts, insurrections, etc.); (2) the struggle inside the Parliaments must be closely connected with the struggle outside; (3) the representatives must take part in general organization work; (4) the representatives must act by directions of the Central Committee and be responsible to it; (5) they must not conform to the Parliamentary manners and customs.
>
> . . . . . .

"We have to state again that the most vital part of the struggle must be outside of Parliament—on the street. It is clear that the most effective weapons of the workers against Capitalism are: The strike, the revolt, armed insurrection. Comrades have to keep in mind the following: Organization of the Party, instalment of the Party groups in the Trade Unions, leadership of the masses, etc. Parliamentary activities and participation in elections must be used only as a secondary measure—no more." (*Call*, April 22, 1920.)

It required no very intelligent reading of events to guess at such a plot without this clear and precise declaration of policy. The disastrous results were quite plain and obvious, and a definite plan was revealed to the most careless of observers. From the day of the Armistice until today not a single week has passed without a strike. Industry is thoroughly unsettled and the future is dark indeed. The aim of these wreckers is to produce by the next winter such general unemployment as to ensure a discontented population on which to work. It is a diabolical plan, but, from their point of view, it is by no means a difficult one to achieve. The exploitation of the people has been brought to a fine art. Every one of these men is an advocate

of despotic government, but they work under the flag of extreme democracy, anarchy, or communism. Posing as the friends of the working classes, they impose upon them with an ease which is disturbing. The British working man is one of the most loyal creatures alive, and perhaps the most credulous. He will give generous support to those who can persuade him that they are concerned only for his welfare. He gets daily and weekly evidence of the success of their endeavours. Wages are increased, and with each increase the working man rubs his hands with satisfaction, and blesses the people who have wrung it out of the hated capitalist. He does not see that, without increased production, increased wages will kill the industry from which he draws his wages. The Jew-Bolshevik policy is to kill that industry, so that unemployment, want, and discontent will ensue. Read the old revolutionary maxim, on which they act today:

> "Want and opinion are the two agents which make all men act. Cause the want, govern opinions, and you will overturn all the existing systems, however well constituted they may appear."

Let us see to it that here in this country they shall not have success. Yet we shall do well to bear in mind Karl Marx's declaration of policy in regard to this country, as quoted by Mrs. Webster. In 1870 he sent the following message to the *Internationale* at Geneva:

1. *England is the only country in which a real Socialistic revolution can be made.*
2. *The English people cannot make this revolution.*
3. *Foreigners must make it for them.*
4. *The foreign members, therefore, must retain their seats at the London board.*
5. *The point to strike at first is Ireland, and in Ireland they are ready to begin their work.*

Ten years ago this would have been regarded as midsummer madness. Today the case of Ireland gives to this message the aspect of a prophecy almost fulfilled. We should do well, however, to keep our eyes on conditions in England, Scotland, and Wales. The destruction of our industries is going on apace. Our industrial existence is dependent upon having a large field of exportation. We least of all nations can continue to exist by "taking in each other's washing.". At the present moment we are filling up the huge

void in our home market caused by the war. These needs will soon be met, and we shall then have to seek markets for our goods in South America, some parts of Europe, the Far East, and in our own Dominions. In these markets, which are neutral, we shall find rivals and shall have to expect severe competition. Mr. Smillie and his miners' executive have increased the price of everything into which coal enters as a part of its manufacture, so that our prices are enhanced and foreign merchants will be driven to cheaper markets at our expense. As it is, our manufacturers cannot give firm quotations. They find themselves forced by the disturbed industrial position in this country to insert saving clauses in their contracts. Just at the present moment, with such leeway to make good, foreign and neutral buyers are willing to put up with the inconveniences of varying prices, but this cannot last long. Those of our manufacturers who have a long view are most pessimistic, and there are signs of increasing unemployment in the near future.

This unemployment—the constant dread of the working man—is, in my opinion, deliberately created by the hotheads of Labour. When the war ended, even with the high prices of labour, a prolonged

period of industrial progress and prosperity was in sight. Labour could have, and no doubt would have, secured its fair share, but Labour is losing the opportunity, and distress, poverty, and unemployment threaten us. The moderate Labour leader knows the danger, and has fought stoutly for his men. But a wave of mad communism—the work of the Jew-Bolsheviks—has caught up a powerful section of Labour, and there is not even any pretence now of safeguarding the interests of the working man. It is all a political game—nationalization, direct action, and open revolution. What do they want, these people? A new heaven and a new earth, fashioned after their ideals? They seek the "proletarian dictatorship"—whatever that may mean. Governments and theories of government must always be judged by their result. If the Jew-Bolsheviks had produced a system by which the governed were happier, freer, and more prosperous than the peoples under other systems, there would be every excuse for any attempt to imitate them. But in Russia trades unionism has been stamped out, religion mocked, liberty denied, and the will of the autocracy of the Soviets impressed on everybody. It is a system of **rule by terror.** Whoever holds an opinion contrary

to the Soviet Government is executed or imprisoned. Disease is rampant, and from all accounts which we get from Russia, never was any country in such a desperately unhappy state. And this is what our extremists want for us?

But is it? Communism, anarchy, and the "dictatorship of the people" are words and convey nothing to the student of history and politics. They are mere terms used to describe phrases of political or popular movements. When they are achieved, there still remains a permanent system of government to devise. We must credit the leaders of Bolshevism with the power of seeing further than their noses, as the common phrase goes. Indeed, some of them are gifted with a very high intelligence, though they seem to possess a low moral standard. They have worked it out to the *n*th degree. Communism cannot in the nature of things be the final end of their hopes and dreams. They know better perhaps than the highest of high old Tories that it is not, and can never be, a permanent system of government. Indeed, in Russia, they have by their acts acknowledged that this is so. As for anarchy, it used to be a favourite subject among the old Russian Nihilists, but it has disappeared from all political programmes of

the Reds, and does not exist now, even as a political dream. There remains the "dictatorship of the peolpe." Luckily for us, it is not necessary to ponder deeply over the meaning of this. Being in actual and active existence in Moscow, we can see exactly what it means, how it works, and the main results. This system of government, so alluring to the working man, and so utterly inimical to his interests, is run by a few men who have usurped authority and have relegated the working classes to a position of serfdom, and are now working with all seriousness for the hegemony of the world. And 80 per cent. of them are Jews.

It would be unfair and un-English to argue from this that all Jews are Bolsheviks. But we may fairly say that the time has come when every country in the world is entitled to ask its Jews what policy they intend to pursue towards this new and alarming danger. Here is a huge country, of enormous resources and illimitable wealth, being run by a company of Jews on a system which can best be described as the denial of democracy. It aims at spreading this abominable theory throughout the world. This is the boast of their own men, not our mere statement. In every country are to be found today representatives of Sovietism, Jew

and Gentile, working feverishly and with excellent organization. In England we are seeing daily the results of the propaganda. Bolshevists here openly declare their intentions to have Soviet government, and they possess a paper, the *Daily Herald*, which is frankly and utterly Bolshevist. The political Jew, who is working for his nation and not for his religion, is active. He is everywhere working with extraordinary activity towards the furtherance of Bolshevist plans. Is it not time to ask those of our Jewish fellow citizens who do not share the views of their fellows to speak out openly and fearlessly?

The attitude of the English Jews is one of surprise that their religion should subject them to suspicion or differential treatment of any kind. They say in effect, "Why are we treated differently from Roman Catholics, Wesleyans, Methodists, Church of England, or any other religious community?" Recently in the *Jewish Guardian* (March 26, 1920) the attitude of English Jewry was thus described.

> "Judaism is a religion, not a nation. It was to Jews as members of a religious body that national rights have been vindicated at the Peace Conference; and it is by Jews as members of a religious body that Judaism will be guarded."

These are admirable sentiments, most of which every tolerant and generous Englishman will endorse. But perhaps he might ask the meaning of the phrase: "It was to Jews as members of a religious body that national rights have been vindicated at the Peace Conference." We presume that the writer intended to convey the idea that the Peace Conference insisted on the Jews of Roumania and Poland having special rights, because they were a religious community and not because they were a separate national entity. But later on in the same article we have a remarkable passage which tends to prove that there are a large number of Jews who desire a distinct nationality for themselves, apart altogether from their religion.

> "Now, is this the policy of the Zionists, not to deprive Western Jews of nationality, but to acquire for such Eastern Jews as want it the opportunity of developing a civic sentiment, repressed and held in check where they dwell? If so, we would ask them four questions: (1) How far is this policy modified by the Minority Treaties enacted and to be enacted, and by the just desire to give them a fair trial? (2) How do the Zionist leaders propose to inform their followers and others that Jewish 'Nationalism' outside Palestine is a mistaken term, without

foothold in the present, or justification in the past, or security in the future? (3) Are they willing that Palestinians of other races and other creeds should share with Jews the civic sense of Palestine? And (4) how do they propose to conciliate the help and co-operation of the many Jews, in whose behalf we are writing, who, untouched, as they are, by political Zionism, are willing, even anxious, to assist in the restoration of Palestine?"

It is obvious, then, that there is a large and powerful section of Jews who cling to their nationality as much as they do to their religion. Indeed, the whole controversy in this matter boils down to the answer to the question, "Are Jews working as a distinct race or merely as members of a distinct religion?"

Let us try to seek the answer to this question from the Jews themselves. The *Jewish Guardian* is out and away the ablest Jewish paper published in England. We must bear testimony to its fairness, broad-mindedness, and general excellence. It must be remembered that it was founded only last year as a protest against the curious attitude of the other Jewish papers. In effect it is anti-Zionist and anti-revolutionary. It stands in rare

contrast to the narrowness and bitterness of its Jewish rivals. Also the *Guardian* commands the services of some of the best pens in British Jewry. In a leading article published August 6th of this year it refers to the question of nationality.

> "We have never disguised our conviction, unpopular in places though it has been, that Zionism (or, more precisely, Zionist 'hotheads,' as Lord Curzon recently described them) brought grist to the mill of those anti-Semites who pretend that Jews are duo-national. The confusion between the philosophic 'nationalism,' which Mr. Leon Simon has expounded in a recent book, and the common nationality of the subjects of one ruler such as King George, has been as unfortunate as it is illogical. We still hold that wiser counsels might have avoided it, and that Jewish leaders, jealous for the good name of other adherents to Judaism than the Zionists, should always have been careful to distinguish between the two uses of one word."

Here we see the recognition of the accusation that the Jews are a nation and the attempt to meet it by Mr. Leon Simon. The *Jewish Guardian* is certainly "up against" the same accusation, and very gallantly, and we believe sincerely, tries to prove that Judaism is a religion pure and simple.

But facts are against it, and alas! facts from its own pages.

Some time in June, the Maccabeans honoured Mr. Lucien Wolf at the Holborn Restaurant by inviting him to a banquet. The event is described in the *Jewish Guardian* of June 11th. Here is the first sentence:

> "Honour to whom honour is due, and all honour to Mr. Lucien Wolf, the man who fought for Jewish rights at Versailles last year."

Now what precisely do the words "Jewish rights" mean? If Judaism is a religion was there any need to fight for its rights, since no country in the world offers any obstacle to the exercise of his religion by any one of its nationals? So we conclude that the "rights" were political and we see the Jewish *nation* at work. If Mr. Lucien Wolf receives the thanks of Jewry for fighting for Jewish rights at Versailles, then Sir Herbert Samuel will, no doubt, do his best to deserve the same thanks for his fight for Jewish rights in Palestine.

Later on in the same account we come across another significant passage. Here it is:

> "The second (message) was a letter from Mr. Israel Zangwill, pungent and self-reminiscent,

but with truth at the bottom of it, as usual. 'The Minority Treaties were the touchstone of the League of Nations, *that essentially Jewish aspiration.* And the man behind the Minority Treaties was Lucien Wolf.'"

I have italicized the description of the League of Nations as being "that essentially Jewish aspiration." Was the establishment of the League of Nations a religious or a political question? Surely, by no stretch of imagination or sophistry, can the League of Nations be regarded as a religious matter. It was political, and again we see the Jewish *nation* at work.

In returning thanks for the many kind things said of him at the banquet, Mr. Lucien Wolf's reply is thus described:

"Then came the sharing of the praise, first to the *Alliance Israelite,* then to the Americans, then to the statesmanship and goodwill of the Conference itself. The Anglo-Jewish members of the Delegation might claim that the first detailed plan of the Minority Treaties was their own. They discussed it with members of the Commission on New States, *but the governing principle had first been accepted from them* (my

italics) by the Allied and Associated Powers and by the League of Nations. Though in the excitement of hearing the Main Treaties all else might be well lost for the moment, he would remind them that the principle laid down in the preamble to the Labour Convention, which secured the rights of the working classes and guaranteed them the protection of the League of Nations, recognized that the rights of minority populations were on exactly the same plane."

Here is the political Jew at work for the Jewish *nation*. There is nothing deserving of blame in this. If political and intensely national Jews care to combine to secure privileges and rights for their co-nationals throughout Europe, they deserve well of Jewry, but the *Jewish Guardian* must not talk nonsense of Judaism being only a religion. It may be that, but in addition it is a strong, active political force, pulling strings in every country for the good of Jewry.

It is here we join issue with those Jews who do not concern themselves with the political and national aims and aspirations of their co-religionists. We want to know how we are to distinguish between the good citizen Jew and the politically

minded Jew who works for Jewry, right or wrong. In this country there are many Jews holding important political offices. We want to know for certain that if at any time British interests and Jewish interests clash he will be British first and Jewish afterwards. How are we to know this? I have shown and this book will show much more amply the great political activity of the Jews. Cannot the good Jews see that it is difficult for us to tolerate this uncertainty, especially with the world in its present state of unrest? We are gradually being forced to deny to Jews political office, unless we can be quite sure that it will be exercised on behalf of our country and Empire and not on behalf of the Jewish race throughout the world. We have seen at the Peace Conference the extraordinary and most successful workings of the Jews among the delegates, and this book will prove that their efforts were almost entirely directed towards safeguarding purely Jewish interests. It is impossible not to be amused at the assertion of Mr. Lucien Wolf that the principle laid down in the preamble to the Labour Convention, which secured the rights of the working classes and guaranteed them the protection of the League of Nations, recognized that the rights of minority

with the epithet. But as long as I see a possibility of the interests of this country and Empire being risked by uncertain allegiance, so long will I continue to denounce it.

H. A. GWYNNE.

Morning Post OFFICE,
August, 1920.

The Cause of World Unrest

CHAPTER I

In the House of Commons, on November 5, 1919, Mr. Winston Churchill gave a very remarkable account of the Russian Revolution. He began by quoting a passage from Ludendorff's book on the war. It occurs in volume ii., page 509:

"By sending Lenin to Russia [says Ludendorff], our Government did moreover assume a great responsibility, but from the military point of view his journey was justified. Russia had to be laid low. But our Government should have seen to it that we were not also involved in her fall."

So far Ludendorff. Let us now see what Mr. Churchill has to say upon the implications of this passage:

"Lenin was sent into Russia by the Germans in the same way that you might send a phial con-

taining a culture of typhoid or of cholera to be poured into the water supply of a great city, and it worked with amazing accuracy. No sooner did Lenin arrive than he began beckoning a finger here and a finger there to obscure persons in sheltered retreats in New York, in Glasgow, in Berne, and other countries, and he gathered together the leading spirits of a formidable sect, *the most formidable sect in the world*, of which he was the high priest and chief. With these spirits around him he set to work with demoniacal ability to tear to pieces every institution on which the Russian State depended. Russia was laid low. Russia had to be laid low. She was laid low in the dust.

"Colonel Ward—But she is not dead yet.

"Mr. J. Jones—Why did you not declare war on him?

"Mr. Churchill—Her national life was completely ruined; the fruits of her sacrifices were thrown away. She was condemned to long internal terrors, and menaced by famine. . . . Her sufferings are more fearful than modern records hold, and she has been robbed of her place among the great nations of the world."

Now let us carefully consider this gloomy, impressive, and almost terrifying passage. What does it mean? It means, first of all, that the German Imperial Government used an organiza-

tion—"the most formidable sect in the world"—for the destruction of Russia. Secondly—as we also gather from Ludendorff—the German Government ran a great risk—"assumed a great responsibility"—in letting loose this mysterious power. Thirdly, Ludendorff seems to suggest that the German Government handled this power clumsily, so that they were also brought down by it. Fourthly—and here we come to Mr. Churchill—the sect was not German only or Russian: its leading spirits were drawn from New York, Glasgow, Berne, and other countries.

It was a power outside Germany, a power outside Russia: it was a world-wide power. And it was a power strong enough to bring Russia down, and also, if we are right in our interpretation of Ludendorff's words, to bring down the Imperial German Government and the House of Hohenzollern.

What was it?

Before attempting to answer this question, let us make another quotation, this time from an author long dead. The Abbé Barruel wrote his *Memoirs of Jacobinism* towards the end of the eighteenth century. The English translation was published in 1797–1798. The Abbé traced the

origin of the French Revolution through a bewildering maze of secret societies, French and German, chiefly Masonic or pseudo-Masonic in form, and all inspired by a common plan. He suggested that the parent sect of the Revolution was the Illuminati founded by the famous "Spartacus" Weishaupt in Bavaria in 1776, and after describing the sinister activities of this and other organizations of a similar kind, he warned his readers in these remarkable words:

"You thought the Revolution ended in France, and the Revolution in France was only the first attempt of the Jacobins. In the desires of a terrible and formidable sect, you have only reached the first stage of the plans it has formed for that general Revolution which is to overthrow all thrones, all altars, annihilate all property, efface all law, and end by dissolving all society."

Now, the Abbé Barruel's book caused a great sensation at the time, and became the centre of a great controversy—both in Europe and America—now almost, if not quite forgotten. Among those who attempted to answer Barruel was Jean Joseph Mounier, famous in the early stages of the Revolution as President of the National Assembly.

Mounier was one of those Liberal-Constitutionalists who seem doomed to be the dupes of the Revolutions over whose early stages they preside.

Mounier then wrote a reply[1] to Barruel. In this reply Mounier pointed out that the Illuminati had been dissolved in 1787.

"How, therefore [he asked], could it have produced the Revolution of France which began in 1789? True, we have been assured that it was continued in more secret forms; but this assertion is out of all probability. . . . They who say the order still exists ought to give up the attempt to persuade the Germans of it, who are witnesses of the conduct of those who established it. . . . If we are to believe the writings of Dr. Robison and M. Barruel, the systems of M. Weishaupt were diffused with the rapidity of the electric fluid."

Here surely is a passage upon which Time sheds a strong and dramatic light.

In 1801 no German believes that the followers of "Spartacus" still exist as a secret society. In 1918 they come out of their shadows and attempt a Revolution in Berlin!

In 1801 it is absurd to suppose that a secret

[1] *Influence of the Philosophers, Free-Masons, and Illuminants on the Revolution in France* (1801).

society, a "formidable sect," could spread from Germany to France "with the rapidity of the electric fluid." In 1919 Mr. Churchill asserts that Revolution was carried from Germany to Russia "in the same way that you might send a phial containing a culture of typhoid."

Barruel then is justified by time. As we shall presently show, he finds support in the researches of modern history. The French Revolution—like the Russian Revolution—was actuated by a formidable sect—"the most formidable sect in the world."

The proofs of this statement we must reserve for a subsequent chapter. In the meantime let us merely state the question which these papers will attempt to answer.

What is this "formidable sect" of which Barruel speaks in the eighteenth century, of which Mr. Churchill speaks in the twentieth? Is it the same then as now? That is a disturbing question. Upon the answer may rest the safety of England—of Christianity—and of the civilization based on Christianity.

"The appalling thing," says Lord Acton in his *Essays on the French Revolution*, "is not the tumult but the design. Through all the fire and smoke

we perceive the evidence of calculating organization. The managers remain studiously concealed and masked, but there is no doubt about their presence from the first."

What was this calculating organization? Lord Acton does not answer. He was too absorbed in his pre-occupation of Constitutionalism—that will-o'-the-wisp which all our Whig historians are eternally chasing through the quaking bogs and the lurid shadows of those terrible times. Was it by any chance the same "formidable sect" which the German Emperor let loose upon Russia?

Mrs. Webster, in her admirable book on the French Revolution,[1] suggests several answers to this question. She recalls the "formidable sect" of the Illuminati of Bavaria, founded by "Spartacus" Weishaupt in 1776, and asks if it can be "mere coincidence" that the Spartacists of modern Germany adopted the pseudonym of their fellow-countryman and predecessor of the eighteenth century.

We shall examine that theory later on.

Then Mrs. Webster goes on to point out that the Internationale, by the admission of Prince Kropotkin, had "a direct filiation" with the

[1] *The French Revolution.* By Nesta H. Webster (1919).

"Enragés" of 1793 and the secret societies of 1795.

That also is a question we shall have to consider.

They are mentioned by Mrs. Webster as an afterthought, suggested no doubt by the terrible events which were taking place when she was completing her book. The main body of her work is occupied with tracing the Orleanist conspiracy, which beyond doubt had its share in those events.

Now the Duke of Orleans was a voluptuary and a coward. Sober historians, after examining his character, laugh at the idea that he could have organized such a conspiracy. Why then was his name—the name Philip Égalité—a rallying cry of those formidable sects which organized the Revolution? That is a question which we must also hold in suspense for a moment.

Then Mrs. Webster allots its due share to the Prussian conspiracy organized by Frederick the Great, and continued by his successor, for the destruction of France. That Prussia had its share in the French Revolution is no longer in doubt. "Anacharsis" Clootz, that horrible Prussian; Ephraim, that horrible German Jew, were probably agents of the House of Hohenzollern.

Had they also a "filiation" with the "formidable sect"? We shall see.

Again, there was the obscure conspiracy to place the Duke of Brunswick on the Throne of France.

There were also English influences at work in the "formidable sect." English gold helped to finance the French Revolution. That is certain. But it is also certain, as Mrs. Webster shows, that it was not the gold of Pitt. The Government of George III. had no hand in the foul conspiracy. The aid was given by certain "revolutionary clubs" in England.

What interest had they in the destruction of the House of Bourbon? Were they also members of the "formidable sect"? If they were—if Bavarians, Prussians, Frenchmen, and Englishmen were all working in the same conspiracy, in the same organization—then the "formidable sect" could not have been French merely. It must have been International.

Are we to believe that even in the eighteenth century there was an "International" devoted to the destruction of Church and State?

The French Clerical, the French Royalist, will reply at once: Certainly, there was Freemasonry.

That is an answer at which Englishmen will be

inclined to laugh, for no one who knew anything of them could suspect our English Freemasons of any revolutionary design. But there is Freemasonry and Freemasonry. The danger of the Masonic organization is this—that every secret society which aims at revolution finds in Freemasonry a disguise which it is almost impossible to penetrate. Freemasons themselves admit, as we shall see later on, that the trowel has been used as a dagger, and that the square has covered a bomb. Let us quote from a witness who upon this point is not likely to lie. Louis Blanc was himself a revolutionary, and his *History of the French Revolution* is written to glorify that event. Let us see, then, what he says on this subject.

After reminding his readers that Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity are words dedicated to Freemasonry he continues:

"As the three grades of ordinary Masonry included a great number of men opposed, by position and by principle, to every project of social subversion, the innovators multiplied the degrees of the mystic ladder to be climbed. They created occult lodges reserved for ardent souls . . . shadowy sanctuaries whose doors were only open to the adept after a long series of proofs calculated

to test the progress of his revolutionary education. . . . It was to these subterranean schools that Condorcet alluded when, in his *Histoire des Progrès de l'Esprit Humain*, interrupted by his death, he promised to tell what blows monarchical idolatry and superstition had received from the secret societies, daughters of the Order of the Templars."

This testimony, as we shall see, does not stand alone. And it has the merit also of explaining a good deal that is otherwise inexplicable. For it is certain that in France the Duke of Orleans was Grand Master both of the Central Masonic Lodge, the Grand Orient, and also of the Templars; that Frederick the Great was Grand Master of a world-wide system of Freemasonry, and that the Duke of Brunswick was Grand Master of the German Freemasons.

Whether these principals were the directors or were the tools of the "formidable sect" is a question that must also be answered.

But in the meantime we must examine a little more closely the words of Louis Blanc's testimony.

We gather from this closer view that the ordinary lodges and the general run of Freemasons—even in France—were not entrusted with the designs of the conspirators. These conspirators

created special lodges—"arrières loges," as they are called—behind (and above) the ordinary lodges. The "innovators" were thus protected by a screen or several screens, one behind the other, of unsuspected and unsuspecting Masons. These were the "shadowy sanctuaries," open only to the adept, where blow upon blow of the revolution could be directed in safety—as from a bomb-proof dug-out or the armoured top of a battleship.

CHAPTER II

WE have seen that the Illuminati are mentioned both by the Abbé Barruel and by Mrs. Webster as one of the Prime Movers of the French Revolution. Indeed, Mrs. Webster goes further and calls "Spartacus" Weishaupt the "inventor of world-revolution." A careful study of Barruel, however, suggests that the Illuminati were only one of many sects which worked with the same means for the same object. They are important chiefly because we know a good deal about them. Their archives were captured and published by the Elector of Bavaria. That makes them interesting, for we can study them, as we study the working of bees in a glass hive. But it is also a danger, for we may be led by our knowledge of them to give them too high a place in the revolutionary hierarchy. We know that this "formidable sect" had a hand in the French Revolution; but it was not the only sect, and it is doubtful if it was the chief sect. Indeed, we shall see when we examine it more

closely that it leads us into a blind alley. It entices us along in the most promising and alluring way; but it ends in a dead wall.

We know a good deal about Adam Weishaupt. He was born in 1748, and at the age of twenty-eight was Professor of Law in the University of Ingolstadt, in Bavaria. We know that even before this early age he had worked out the general lines of his system and of his philosophy. But there is one thing we do not know—Did he work out the system for himself or was he inspired thereto by some unknown and unsuspected teacher?

We do know, by the way, that he was a thoroughpaced scoundrel, for among his intercepted correspondence was a series of letters, written by him to various initiates, imploring them to help him to find the means to destroy the unborn child of his sister-in-law, before its birth should overwhelm him with disgrace. After such a confession we are entitled to doubt if the philosophy he professed was the real motive of his activities.

His philosophy need not detain us very long. It is the old familiar set of fallacies and unproved assumptions formulated some little time before by Jean Jacques Rousseau, and long since exploded

by historians on the one side and by men of science on the other.

Liberty and equality are the essential rights that man in his original and primitive perfection received from Nature. Property destroyed Equality; Governments and Religions destroyed Liberty; therefore to reinstate man in his original rights it was necessary to destroy all Religions, all Civil Societies, and all Property.

This was to be done by secret organization—

"Yes," he prophesied, "princes and nations shall disappear from off the face of the Earth. Yes, a time shall come when man shall acknowledge no other Law than the great book of Nature. This Revolution shall be the work of our Secret Societies, and that is one of our Grand Mysteries."

It may be noted in passing that he uses the plural—as if he were aware that there were others working along tunnels similar to those which he and his confederates were digging so busily.

He began with his pupils of Ingolstadt, the general idea being that "each class of my order must be the preparatory school for the next." He educated a class of "Insinuators," whose business was to secure initiates, and these initiates were only let into the secrets of the organizations

when they were proved to be faithful and had gone too far to draw back.

The scope of these designs is revealed in the following passage, which might almost persuade us that we are in the presence of the "formidable sect":

"When the object is a universal Revolution, all the members of these Societies, aiming at the same point, and aiding one another, must find means of governing invisibly, and without any appearance of violent measures, not only the higher and more distinguished class of any particular State, but even of all stations, of all nations, of every religion, insinuate the same spirit everywhere; in silence, but with the greatest possible activity, direct the scattered inhabitants of the Earth towards the same point."

With marvellous patience and cunning, Weishaupt elaborated a secret organization closely resembling Masonry, of four classes, subdivided into six degrees. Young men were tempted into it upon various false pretences, and before very long the organization had great power in Bavaria and other parts of Germany.

Then came a great chance. Weishaupt was fortunate in two disciples, "Cato" Zwack and the

Hanoverian Baron, "Philo" Knigge, who had dabbled in Freemasonry, and with these two he conceived the project of capturing or illuminizing the Masonic Lodges.

Weishaupt's instructions on the gentle art of capturing Freemasonry are interesting:

"In every town of any note situated within their district the secret chapters shall establish lodges for the three ordinary degrees, and shall cause men of sound morals, of good repute, and of easy circumstances, to be received in these lodges. Such men are much to be sought after, and are to be made Masons, even though they should not be of any service to Illuminism in its ulterior projects."

These methods succeeded beyond expectation. Weishaupt and his initiates were soon in secret control of a multitude of lodges throughout Germany.

But the great chance came with the universal Masonic Congress at Wilhelmsbaden in 1782. At that Congress "Philo" Knigge was busy, and he gleefully reports his progress to his Master: "All of them," writes Knigge, "were enchanted with our degrees of Epopt and of Regent." Into these degrees the Freemasons were enlisted in shoals.

The centre of the conspiracy was now in Frankfort, and was spreading in all directions. The South German States, Prussia, Austria, Holland, were all infected. A trusted agent was sent to London "slily to illuminize the English." Several of the German Courts were almost completely in the hands of the Illuminati. Their prestige was becoming enormous.

But in the height of his success, Weishaupt received a staggering blow. The Elector of Bavaria swooped down upon him, obtained evidence, both written and oral, which filled Germany with horror and covered the sect with confusion. Weishaupt fled to another part of Germany; but his organization continued, and, as we shall presently see, its agents or fugitives helped to precipitate that Revolution in France which they had failed to effect in Germany.

We have said that our study of the Illuminati only leads us into a *cul-de-sac*, a blind alley. We come to Adam Weishaupt, and we get no further back. But at its other end this blind alley joins the main roads, or rather tunnels, of "occult" Freemasonry and Revolution.

We find this "filiation" quite clearly in Mirabeau's visits to Berlin. Mirabeau returned from

Berlin with two enthusiasms, the one for the Jews, the other for the Illuminati. Of the former enthusiasm we shall have something to say later: the latter enthusiasm bore immediate fruit. Mirabeau induced "Amelius" Bode, the disciple and successor of "Spartacus" Weishaupt, to "illuminize" the French Masonic Lodges.

There is no doubt that at that time French Freemasonry was assuming certain very dangerous and subversive forms. France was, in fact, covered with a web of secret organizations of the Masonic type, and of these Lodges practically all the Jacobins were members.

The Grand Orient itself had become a vast revolutionary organization. Under the nominal rule of the Grand Master, Philip Égalité, Duke of Orleans, were the Lodges of no less than 282 French towns; there were besides 81 Lodges in Paris and 16 at Lyons. Every Lodge sent its Deputy to the Grand Orient, and every Lodge had its President, whose duty consisted in forwarding the orders of the Grand Orient, or in preparing the Brethren for the orders which they were to receive.

As early as 1776, the Central Committee of the Grand Orient instructed its subordinates to prepare the Brethren for insurrection. They were to

visit the Lodges throughout France, to conjure them by the Masonic Oath, and to announce that the time had at last come to accomplish their ends in the death of tyrants.

Barruel (English edition, vol. ii., p. 438) gives an account of the manner in which these orders were executed at Lille in that year. The officers of the Regiment of La Sarre, stationed at that town, were, many of them, Freemasons, and these were invited to meet the Agent of the Grand Orient, an officer of the Artillery called Sinetty. In a grandiloquent speech he told them that the Universe was about to be freed from its fetters, that the tyrants called Kings were to be vanquished, and that Religion and Kings were to give way to Light, Liberty, and Equality. The officers were good Masons, and they were also loyal subjects of their King. They treated the message half as a disagreeable joke, half as an incomprehensible incident to be dismissed from their minds. But, being bound by their Masonic oath, they did not report the incident to headquarters.

While the Grand Orient thus organized Revolution throughout France, various occult Lodges had their parts in the movement. Thus the Paris Lodge of the Coq Héron was the seat of the propa-

ganda. Its chiefs were the Duc de la Rochefoucault, Condorcet, and Sieyès, and in 1790 they controlled funds of twenty million livres, or £900,000, at that time an enormous sum.

Barruel quotes the main principle on which they founded their hopes of a Revolution:

"Want and opinion are the two agents which make all men act. Cause the want, govern opinions, and you will overturn all the existing systems, however well consolidated they may appear."

Now Barruel quotes this revolutionary maxim on the authority of one Dr. Girtanner, who, he says, had been able to penetrate the secrets of revolutionary Masonry in Paris. Was it acted upon? Everybody knows that one main cause of the Revolution in Paris was the scarcity of bread. That scarcity is usually said to be due to a bad harvest. Mrs. Webster, however, quotes many authorities to show that the scarcity was aggravated by the deliberate action of certain people who bought and held up the grain. These people, in her view, were agents of the Duke of Orleans and of what is called the Orleanist conspiracy.

"Montjoie [says Mrs. Webster] asserts that agents employed by the Duc d'Orléans deliber-

ately bought up the grain, and either sent it out of the country or concealed it in order to drive the people to revolt, and in this accusation he is supported by innumerable contemporaries, including the democrat, Fantin-Des Odoards, Mounier, whose integrity is not to be doubted, the Liberal Malouet, Ferrières, and Madame de la Tour du Pin. Beaulieu, however, one of the most reliable of contemporaries, considers that the Orleanists would have been unable to create a famine by these means, but that they accomplished their purpose by stirring up public feeling on the subject of monopolizers, thereby inducing the people to pillage the grain. The farmers and corn merchants, therefore, fearing that their supplies would be destroyed in transit, were afraid to release them. By this means a fictitious famine was created."

Here at least is evidence which makes Girtanner's statement credible. He states that the secret societies planned to create scarcity; contemporaries believed that scarcity was created, but put it down not to the secret organizations of which they knew nothing, but to the Duke of Orleans.

As to the other economic cause of the French Revolution, the spell of bad trade and unemployment, it was produced by the Eden Treaty, a

commercial treaty so disadvantageous to France that it was ascribed by contemporaries either to corruption or treachery. Here also Girtanner's statement furnishes a clue which might be worth while for the student to follow up. What remains certain is that the economic crisis which preceded the Revolution was intensified, if not created, by artificial causes. That these causes were part of a conspiracy to bring about Revolution is not certain, but possible—and probable.

But to return. Among the "arrière loges"—in whose "shadowy sanctuaries" the Revolution was plotted—we must mention the Lodges of the *Amis Réunis* and the Philalèthes. The latter was the haunt of those philosophers and dabblers in literature who in all ages are the easy prey of their vanity. The former sheltered such political fanatics as Condorcet, Brissot, Danton, Saint-Martin, and Savalette de Lange. It was to this retreat that Mirabeau brought "Amelius" Bode, the Baron de Busche, and the other Illuminati who were to "illuminize" French Freemasonry. But French Freemasonry hardly required "illuminization" from Germany. The work had already been carried through by kindred spirits, if not by fellow-conspirators.

Among these shadowy and sinister figures were the notorious "Count Cagliostro," whose real name was Joseph Balsamo—a practitioner of all forms of magic, alchemy, and fraud—and the "Count of Saint-Germain," a Theosophist, as we should now call him, who boasted that he had lived through several incarnations. It was this impostor who founded the sect of Adamites, some little distance outside Paris, in which, according to Barruel, the two sexes lived in promiscuous concubinage, one lady only being reserved as the peculiar property of the founder, then, according to his own reckoning, in his 130th year.

Nor should we forget Martinez Pasqualis, generally reputed to be a Portuguese Jew, who founded his Order of Cohens, with a programme which owed something to the ancient mysteries of the Cabala. Pasqualis and his successor, Saint-Martin, worked in France on very much the same lines as Weishaupt worked in Germany. Indeed, the more we look at this eighteenth-century network of secret conspiracy, the more probable does it seem that they all owed something to a common inspiration at that time and up till now suspected but unknown.

When the Revolution came some at least of

these secret workers emerged from their shadowy sanctuaries and came into the open. The Jacobins were not only initiates themselves, but ruled their affairs in ghastly imitation of the Masonic order.

"It is not by chance [says Barruel] that the Jacobin Clubs both in Paris and the Provinces become the general receptacle for Rosicrucians, Knights Templars, Knights of the Sun, and Knights Kadosch; or of those in particular who, under the name of Philalèthes, were enthusiastically wedded to the mysteries of Swedenborg, whether at Paris, Lyons, Avignon, Bordeaux, or Grenoble. . . . The list is public, and it contains the names of all the profound adepts who had hitherto been dispersed among the Lodges." (*Barruel*, vol. iv., p. 382.)

Were they the real plotters of the Revolution, or were they, too, puppets, who danced obediently to the guidance of an unseen hand? Their fate suggests their rôle, for all or nearly all of them died under the guillotine, carrying with them their dark secrets to be buried for ever in the quicklime of the general fosse.

CHAPTER III

IT is now evident how the Revolutionaries worked under the cloak of Freemasonry for the downfall of France. We are therefore driven to consider more closely the nature not indeed of Freemasonry in the English sense, but of those orders of Freemasonry which in various parts of the world are generally associated with political propaganda.

It is commonly supposed—and in our own country and the United States there is sufficient ground for the supposition—that Masonic ritual consists of certain innocent and friendly, though symbolic, ceremonies, which aim at strengthening the noble duties of charity, fraternity, loyalty, and fair-dealing among men who are true citizens of their Empire and whole-hearted believers in Christian morality. "To so high an eminence has the credit of Freemasonry been advanced," says the old English *Charge* to initiates, "that in every age Monarchs themselves have been promoters of the art, have not thought it derogatory from their

dignity to exchange the sceptre for the trowel, have patronized our mysteries and joined in our Assemblies." In 1799 and 1817, the British House of Commons, in specific Acts, recognized the laudable character of the craft and provided for its continuance.

So far, well. The history of Freemasonry, however, though it may start in England with the three orders, or degrees, of "Entered Apprentice," "Fellow Craft," and "Master," by no means ends there, and in the veiled accounts of certain Continental Lodges we come upon forms of ritual and upon dark sayings that are not only foreign to the atmosphere of the "Mother Grand Lodge," but that point to underlying motives which, if they bear any real significance, are significant of evil. Whether or not the successive degrees in revolutionary Masonry constitute a hierarchy, each receiving its orders from the degree immediately above, or are mainly independent societies, it is difficult to say; but it is noteworthy that the higher the degree the more mysterious and disquieting appear its ceremonies. There are at least thirty-three separate degrees, each with a peculiar ritual of its own, based on the alleged history of the Order, and each conducting

its observances and deliberations with the utmost secrecy.

In the lower orders the initiate into the secrets of revolutionary Masonry is allowed to hear the words Liberty and Equality only occasionally, but when his ears have grown familiar with them, and after he has learned how to be silent, he is raised to the grade of Master. It is then that he hears for the first time of a Founder, whose murder has to be revenged. The succeeding grades, especially those from the ninth upwards, so accustom him to the idea of vengeance that it finally becomes habitual. Every Master Mason is entrusted with a twofold commission—first, to seek for the lost word, which he finds in a higher grade to be Jehovah, or natural religion; and, secondly, to revenge the death of Hiram, of which the Master's sign is a constant memorial—a feigned stab with the thumb. In the ninth degree (the Elected Knights of the Nine) a still more emphatic ceremony is observed. According to Albert Pike's *Ritual of the Southern Jurisdiction of the U. S.* (Scottish Rite), each new entrant and eight already Elected Knights lay aside their Masonic clothing and jewels, and each is armed with a sword and dagger. They enter a room which is lighted only

by a single lamp set on the floor, by the side of a couch of leaves, on which is placed a representation of Abairam sleeping.

"'Here is the assassin?' says the Master of Ceremonies. 'Strike boldly at his head and heart, and revenge the death of the Master!' The candidate does so with his dagger, a voice exclaiming 'Nekum!' [Hebrew for revenge]—and the Master of Ceremonies, having with his sword separated the bleeding head from the trunk, gives it to the candidate, who, holding it in his right hand, returns to the chapter-room."

It is in the ninth order, too, that the philosophy of goodwill and benevolence to mankind, inculcated in the lower degrees, is supplemented by an eloquent appeal to destroy Ignorance, Tyranny, and Fanaticism, and it is interesting to notice that in this and the succeeding degrees numerous Hebrew names and associations creep into the rituals. The following striking passage is taken from the ritual of the eleventh degree (the Sublime Knights Elu of the Twelve):

"*The Venerable Master:* My Brethren, are you willing to take upon yourselves the duties of Governors in Israel, and chiefs over the tribute,

with the resolution to discharge those duties faithfully and impartially?

"*All:* We are. . . .

"*The V. M.:* Let then our Chancellor write the degree . . . making these twelve our Viceregents, each in his Province, to be obeyed accordingly."

The next three orders are engaged in symbolic rituals dealing with the rebuilding of the Temple of Solomon which are difficult to understand, but considerable light is thrown upon their meaning in the concluding catechism of the 15th degree (the Knights of the East, Sword or Eagle):

"*Q.*: Of what are the ruins of the walls of the city and the Holy House an emblem?

"*A.*: Of a country that has lost its liberties, and an Order ruined and proscribed.

"*Q.*: To what do the seventy lights of the Lodge allude?

"*A.*: To the seventy years of Hebrew captivity.

"*Q.*: Of what are the chains of the captives, with their triangular links, an emblem?

"*A.*: Of the three powers that have in all ages fettered the human intellect and chained the limbs of the people: the Kings, Priests, and Nobles— of TYRANNY, SUPERSTITION, and PRIVILEGE.

"*Q.*: What art do you profess?

"*A.*: Freemasonry.

"*Q.*: What do you build?

"*A.*: Temples and Tabernacles.

"*Q.*: Where?

"*A.*: In the souls of men, and among the nations.

"*Q.*: Which way do you travel?

"*A.*: From Babylon to Jerusalem. . . ."

It is not difficult to see whither all this symbolism and catechism points. As the candidate becomes more and more initiated into the secrets and inner history of his craft he becomes more and more familiar with the idea of liberty as a basic principle in Masonic life and thought, and to the possibility of himself having, if need be, to offer up his life "in the cause of downtrodden races" and "in defence of free government." Such an ideal sounds noble enough, but let us try to find out what motive lies behind it. We have mentioned that one of the duties of a Master Mason in revolutionary Masonry is to seek for the "lost word." By the time he is fully initiated as a Rosicrucian (18th degree) he has learned that the day on which the word JEHOVAH was lost is precisely that on which the Son of God died on the Cross.

"As soon as the candidate [says the Abbé Barruel] has proved that he understands the Masonic meaning of the inscription INRI (Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews), the Master [of Cere-

monies] exclaims, *My dear Brethren, the word is found again*, and all present applaud the luminous discovery, that He whose death was the consummation and the grand mystery of the Christian Religion was no more than a common Jew crucified for his crimes. . . . It is on the Gospel and on the Son of Man that the adept is to avenge the brethren, the Pontiffs of Jehovah."

The Knights Templars (27th degree) have again and again been accused of like heretical practices, and it seems clear from the evidence that the charge of denying Christ and defiling the Cross at their Ceremony of Initiation has been firmly established. Step by step are the initiates into the deeper secrets led to abandon belief, not only in Christianity, but in all revealed religion, and by making them out and out materialists the ground is prepared for the seeds of the Jacobinical code of Revolution. When at length the candidate is admitted into the 30th grade, and, after going through terrifying ordeals to test his obedience and secrecy, becomes a Knight Kadosch, he learns that it is no longer Adoniram or Hiram whose death cries for vengeance. The grade of Kadosch commemorates, he is informed, the suppression of the Order of Templars by Pope Clement V. and Philip

le Bel, together with the murder of the Grand Commander, Jacques de Molai, who was burned alive by Philip's orders on March 11, 1314.

Thus is the mask completely thrown aside, and the hidden designs of the Red Masonic orders made clear. The objects to be pursued and annihilated are the two great institutions of the Christian world, represented by Clement V. and Philip IV., the Church and the State. "The religion which is to be destroyed to recover the *word*, or the true doctrine," remarks Barruel with true insight (vol. ii., p. 325), "is the religion of Christ, founded on revelation. This word in its full extent is *Liberty and Equality*, to be established by the total overthrow of the altar and the throne."

We conclude with a few significant sentences taken from the catechism of the Knights Kadosch degree. (We have been unable to obtain any authentic information on the ritual of the higher degrees.)

"My Brother [the Candidate], you desire to unite yourself to an Order which has laboured in silence and secrecy for more than five hundred years with a single end in view, and hitherto with only partial success. . . . The Order of Knights Kadosch has for its mission the avenging of a great

crime. . . . Do you fully understand that this degree is not, like much of so-called Masonry, a sham that means nothing and amounts to nothing; . . . that what you are now engaged in is *real*, will require the performance of *duty*, will exact *sacrifice*, will expose you to *danger;* and that this Order means to deal with the affairs of nations and be once more a Power in the world?"

We have seen, so far (1) that Revolution is not a spontaneous combustion of the social order; but that (2) the match is set by some secret agency or "formidable sect"; (3) that this agency conceals itself in the shadowy sanctuaries of certain forms of Freemasonry; and (4) that these subversive forms of Freemasonry have a ritual of hatred for the Cross and veneration for the Temple which suggest a Hebraic origin.

But having got so far, we are faced by another question—if these secret societies instigate revolutions, who or what instigates the secret societies?

And here, as in the case of the Freemasons, we must be careful not to suggest any unfair suspicion of innocent people. If we find a distinctly Jewish ritual in these subversive orders of Freemasons, that is not to suggest that all Jews are Freemasons or are subversive. On the contrary, it is evident

that many Jews are good citizens and patriotic British subjects. What is alleged, however—and this allegation we must examine—is that a secret sect of Jews cherish political designs of a subversive nature, and that this sect works for revolution behind a mask of Freemasonry.

Now we have remarked that the ritual, particularly of the Templars, is both Hebraic and suggestive of a design of revenge. It might help us a little, then, to inquire into the origin of this particular Order, with which the "Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite" as practised by the Red Lodges is historically connected.

And, indeed, no less an authority than Augustus Schlegel points the way:

"The Order of the Templars [says Schlegel in his *Philosophy of History*] has been the bridge over which all that body of mysteries (*i.e.*, of esoteric Freemasonry) has passed into the Occident. . . . Through them come the traditions of Solomon and his Temple. . . . A society from the breast of which, as from a laboratory where the spirit of destruction forged its arms, came the Albigenses, the Jacobins, and the Carbonari, could not have a tendency truly Christian nor a constitution politically just, nor could it exercise a beneficent influence on humanity in general."

The most eminent specialist on this subject of the history of the Templars is the Comte le Couteulx de Canteleu, whose book[1] on secret societies and sects is founded not upon legend and tradition merely but upon the archives of the Templars themselves in his own possession and elsewhere.

The Count explains how this crusading Order during its long stay of half a century in Palestine formed a close and sinister connection with the Order of Assassins or Hachichiens—a branch of the Ishmaelites of the East, whose members must have been Jewish, since their object was the rebuilding of Solomon's Temple. This secret society infested the mountains round Jerusalem, and carried on a war of brigandage and assassination both against the Saracens and the Crusaders.

"The Templars [says our author], seeing that the Realm of Jerusalem was going swiftly towards its ruin, made alliance and treaty with the Assassins. It appears to be certain that it was Guillaume de Montbard who received from the Old Man of the Mountain the Masonic initiation in a

[1] *Les Sectes et Sociétés Secrètes, Politiques et Religeuses; essai sur leur histoire depuis les temps les plus re-oulés jusqu' à la Révolution française* (1863).

cavern in the Liban, and transmitted it to his companions, who were all initiated in the Masonic cult."

It is certain that when the Templars returned to Europe they were accused of following an un-Christian and blasphemous ritual.

Two Masonic—or rather, as they call themselves, "co-Masonic"—writers, A. Bothwell-Gosse and L. J. Dickinson, find in the accounts of this ritual preserved in the famous trial proofs that the Order of the Templars had been initiated into the secrets of Masonry. "It seems probable," say these two writers in their book on the Templars, "that there was a basis of truth even in the accusations of a horrible or grotesque kind: but it was a truth perverted or misunderstood, distorted by the ignorance of uninitiated observers, who misinterpreted fragments of ritual that they could not comprehend." In the beginning of the fourteenth century, Philip le Bel, of France, with the more or less reluctant consent of the Pope, Clement V., dispersed the Order and burned many of its leaders—including the famous Jacques de Molai—at the stake.

At the same time Philip drove the Jews out of France.

Now, it is possible—although here again anything in the nature of proof is wanting—that the Templars and the Jews made common cause. What is certain is that the Templars survived as a secret Masonic organization with a ritual inspired by hatred of and vengeance on Church and State.

The execution of Jacques de Molai in the fourteenth century is one of those unhappy far-off things for which no sane man would nourish an active resentment; but revenge for the execution of Jacques de Molai, turned into a ritual against Church, and King is another matter. That ritual was practised on the eve of the French Revolution. When the head of Louis XVI. fell into the sack not only was the death of Jacques de Molai revenged upon a descendant of Philip le Bel, but a proscribed Order—and a proscribed race—were revenged both, and at once, upon Church and State.

And now as to the connection between the Order of the Templars and what is called the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite practised in the Grand Orient and the Lodges of Red Masonry the world over. When Philip le Bel dispersed the Order in France, he advised his brother monarch, Edward II., to follow his example in England. Edward

took his advice, although his persecution was more mild and more dilatory than the French King's, and as a result of these two persecutions many of the Knights are said to have been driven into Scotland.

Tradition says that an eminent band of French Templars, disguised as operative Masons, landed on the island of Mull, and were received by the Scottish Grand Master. These Knights, it is said, helped Robert the Bruce to win the Battle of Bannockburn, and with his connivance founded the famous Lodge of Kilwinning, which claims an apostolic succession both in ritual and government. When the Jacobite cause found refuge in France, the Scottish Rite was brought back to the home of its founders, and was accepted by the Grand Orient, as a convenient symbolism for its work of subversion.

The ritual also reached Germany, and in 1762 Frederick the Great, who had taken under his wing the patronage of all German Masonry, promulgated his Grand Constitution, the Constitution being confirmed also at Bordeaux in the same year. In 1786, Frederick's new Constitution of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite delegated his powers to a Council for each nation. And

from France, in 1761, one Stephen Morin—probably but not certainly a Jew—was deputed by the Grand Consistory of the Sublime Princes of the Royal Secret, of whom the Duke de Chartres, afterwards the Duke of Orleans, was the one designated to carry the torch to the New World.

Thus a ritual originating among the Ishmaelites and Assassins of Mount Lebanon gradually penetrated Europe and the New World. It is a singular story, but suggests rather than proves the connection between the Hebraic and Masonic secret organizations.

There is, indeed, at least one document which supports this theory. It is quoted in Deschamps' *Les Sociétés Secrètes et la Société* (vol. iii., Annexe B), and purports to be a letter from a certain Jean Baptiste Simonini written from Florence on the 1st August, 1806, to the Abbé Barruel congratulating him on his book, which Simonini had just read. The Abbé, it will be remembered, had contended in his *Memoirs of Jacobinism* that the French Revolution had been in great part engineered by certain Masonic organizations. Simonini informs the Abbé that his conclusions are correct but do not go far enough, and that behind the Masons were the Jews. He goes on to tell how during the

Revolution he was at Piémont, and for his own safety contrived to persuade certain Jews who were active in the Revolution there that he was himself a Jew by descent. They induced him to become a Mason, and told him, when he had thoroughly won their confidence, that Maues and the Old Man of the Mountains were Jews; that the Freemasons and Illuminés were founded by Jews; that all anti-Christian sects emanated from them, that they had many partisans within the Church both in Italy and Spain; that the Bourbons were their hereditary enemies; that they had made themselves masters of Christian wealth, which they were using to promote revolution; and that they promised themselves in less than a century to be masters of the world; to abolish all other sects; themselves to become the Rulers; to make synagogues of the Christian churches; and to reduce the Christian peoples to a state of slavery.

Barruel, who had written his book without any such suspicion, was puzzled what to do with the letter. He did not desire to give publicity to a statement which he could not prove, and he determined to inform the authorities of its contents and give the letter into the keeping of his ecclesiastical superiors (in whose archives it still remains). In

the course of his short annotations on the document, however, he suggests that, owing to the double persecution of Philip le Bel, the Jews may have made common cause with the Templars, and that this may be the origin of the Masonic degree of Kadosch.

A remarkable attempt to supplement evidence by argument is made by M. Copin-Albancelli in his book, *La Conjuration Juive Contre le Monde Chrétien* (1909). M. Copin-Albancelli's thesis is that except the Jews there is no race or interest capable of inspiring the continuous hatred of Church and State which he finds in French Freemasonry. Further, that the Jews at one time had a Government; that there is evidence of the existence of this Government after the Dispersion; that it was driven underground by the various persecutions to which the Jews have been subjected; but that it still exists as a secret organization. And he comes to the conclusion, from an elaborate process of argument, that the occult power which works behind Freemasonry is no other than the secret government of the Jewish nation (p. 435).

We do not propose to examine the logical steps—some of them giant strides—by which M. Copin-Albancelli advances to this conclusion. We may

point out, however, that there are certain obvious difficulties. One is that Freemasonry in general—both in England and in Germany—was closed to the Jews, at least through the greater part of the eighteenth century, although there is reason to suppose that this exclusion did not apply in certain of the governing or occult orders of Continental Freemasonry.

CHAPTER IV

WE have seen how M. Copin-Albancelli attempted to prove that subversive Freemasonry was the secret government of the Jews. This argument has the horrible implication that certain groups of the Jewish race have a secret organization which works for the destruction of the Christian nations.

A moderate and probably truthful view of this question is contained in a very remarkable book by the Abbé Joseph Lémann (*L'Entrée des Israélites dans la Société française*). Lémann, it is important to note, was himself a Jew who embraced Christianity and became a Christian priest.

Lémann, then, describes the assertions which we have discussed as an exaggeration—"*une thèse exagérée.*" He admits, however, that very close relations exist between Jewry and the secret societies. And he sets these relations down to the Hebraic antagonism against Christianity which led the Jews "to utilize secret societies, more or less, for their own interests."

Lémann points to the origin of these occult Masonic societies in the Cabal—a Hebrew word meaning "received tradition." From the time of Moses to the time of Christ, the Cabal had existed as the oral but secret custodian of the most sublime truths of the Hebraic religion. It was the philosophy of the Hebrews. But at the Dispersion it turned from wine to vinegar, and passed either into a shadowy realm of vain speculations, or occupied itself with magic, terrible vows and sinister symbols, and the operations of a hateful conspiracy against the Christian religion. It was the father of Sorcery, Astrology, Alchemy, and of all the false sciences of the Middle Ages.

But here Lémann makes an important reservation:

"This science cabalistic, abstruse on its speculative side, bad and wicked on its practical side, was known only to a small number of Israel. Most honest Jews, occupied with their daily affairs, and their patriarchal customs, although not loving the Saviour of the World and His Church, had no *penchant* for, nor pleasure in, this commerce with the Cabal and with magic."

Owing to the strict watch kept by the Church and by the Christian monarchs, it was difficult, if

not impossible, to establish relations between the Hebrew Cabal and the secret societies. Moreover, an Albigeois or a Templar would have been too proud to call a Jew his companion in arms—and in mysteries.

But with the eighteenth century things changed for the worst. The various secret societies concentrated in Freemasonry and became democratic and universal. The Convention of Wilhelmsbaden was their Grand Hall of Reunion.

How far did Judaism participate? Lémann answers this question. In 1754, he says, a Portuguese Jew, named Martinez Paschalis, had founded in France a sect, based on the Cabal, under the name of the Order of Cohens (a Hebrew word) or Priests. After his death the famous Saint-Martin had developed the sect, which spread from Paris and Lyons as far as Russia. Its sectaries were then called Martinists, or French Illuminés.

Such was the preface of the *liaison positive* between Judaism and the secret societies.

It was a disturbing apparition—says Lémann—this union between this perverted Judaism and these degraded societies. For the one seemed to say to the other: "Tomorrow you will be with me, my plans will be your plans."

Lémann proceeds to describe "this little battalion of advanced Jews"—Moses Mendelssohn, who took the delicate rôle of conciliator between Jews and Christians; Wilhelm Dohm, a Prussian official, who utilized the arguments of Rousseau for the emancipation of the Jews; the banker, Cerfbeer, who undertook singlehanded to break down the Jewish pale of Strasbourg—to these men came Mirabeau, the Gentile Revolutionary and Freemason.

In the work on Masonic ritual in America, prepared by Albert Pike, an interesting passage in a supplementary note to the Fourteenth Degree deplores the springing up of "a dissident Masonry, opposed to the orthodox," to which schism are ascribed "the greatest calamities of the French Revolution," and, in an attempt to vindicate the ideals of "orthodox" Masonry, the passage continues:

"We shall perhaps be asked how if Masonry is so sublime and so holy, it could have been proscribed and so often condemned by the Church? We have replied to this question in speaking of the schisms and profanations of Masonry. . . . Masonry has not only been profaned, but it has even served as a veil and pretext for the plottings

of anarchy, by the secret influence of the avengers of Jacques de Molai. . . . The Anarchists have retaken the Rule, the Square and the Mallet, and written on them 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.' That is to say, Liberty for the covetous to plunder, Equality for the basest, and Fraternity to destroy."

Such protestations of sorrow from "orthodox" Freemasons of the Red Orders may or may not be genuine. We do not take it upon ourselves to judge. The hope of a more profitable inquiry lies, we fancy, in another direction: to what precisely does the above passage refer? Like all Masonic writing, it is enigmatical, and it would be a mistake to give it a too narrow and literal interpretation. Two points are clear, however. The "dissident" Masons are charged with using Masonry "as a veil and pretext for the plottings of anarchy," and these plottings are held in real, or assumed, abhorrence by the "orthodox" Masons. Let us see if we can discover the historical origin of this schism.

In the year 1761, a certain Stephen Morin was invested by the Grand Consistory of Sublime Princes of the Royal Secret in Paris with power to carry the Rite of Perfection to America. Among those who signed the paper was the Duke of

Chartres, afterwards the Duke of Orleans, "Philip Égalité," Grand Master both of the Grand Orient and the Templars, and Morin himself is described as a Grand Perfect Elect and Past Sublime Master, etc., of all orders of Masonry. Now it has been stated that Morin was a Jew, but the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, in its article on Freemasonry, says that this point is in doubt. What is certain is that when Morin arrived in America he gave powers to a number of deputies who certainly were Jews. Thus, for example, his deputy inspector, Henry Francken, appointed Moses M. Hayes at Boston, and Hayes in his turn made Brother Da Costa deputy inspector-general for South Carolina, Solomon Bush deputy for Pennsylvania, and B. M. Spitzer deputy for Georgia. In 1783, Da Costa established in Charleston a Sublime Grand Lodge of Perfection; a Council of Princes of Jerusalem was also constituted, and also a Council of Knights Kadosch. In 1786, Charleston received the Grand Constitution from Germany, and in 1801 a Convention was held to form a Supreme Council of the Thirty-third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite. In those various institutions, such Jews as Meyers, Spitzer, John Mitchell, and Frederick Dalcho were prominent, and although

the *Jewish Encyclopædia* alleges that the Jews were not in control of the movement, and were not in the highest degrees, it is quite evident from the names in the original proceedings that in the creation of these Charleston institutions Jewish influence was either supreme or very strong.

In the year 1896 there appeared in Paris a curious publication called *Le Diable au XIX^e^ Siècle.* It was an attack upon Freemasonry, and came out in parts, illustrated with grotesque and repulsive engravings. The name on the title-page is Dr. Bataille, but it is stated in the *British Museum Catalogue* that the real authors were Gabriel Jogand-Pagès and Charles Hacks. The book, with evident knowledge and a show of authority, set out to trace the connection between Freemasonry and revolutions, but its sensationalism and the extremely doubtful character of some of the documents produced brought it into disrepute. It is now forgotten, and yet it contains a good deal that can be verified from other sources, and some things also which seem to be verified by recent events. In particular there is a letter—or an alleged letter—said to have been written by Albert Pike, the "Sovereign Pontiff of Universal Freemasonry," assisted by the Ten Ancients of

the Grand Lodge of the Supreme Orient at Charleston, to "the very illustrious brother" Giuseppe Mazzini. This letter is dated (in Masonic style) August 15, 1871, and sets forth an anti-clerical policy which Mazzini is to follow in Italy. The measures proposed, including secular education, the expulsion of the religious orders, and so forth, need not detain us. What is to our purpose occurs towards the end of the letter, on page 605 (vol. ii.). The writer explains that owing to the working out of this policy the Pope may be driven at some future time out of Italy, and that established religion will then find its last refuge in Russia. And the letter proceeds:

"That is why, when the autocratic Empire of Russia will have become the citadel of Papal Christianity (adonaïsme papiste), we shall unchain the revolutionary Nihilists and Atheists, and we shall provoke a formidable social cataclysm, which will demonstrate clearly to the nations, in all its horror, the effect of absolute unbelief, mother of savagery and of the most bloody disorder. Then, everywhere, the citizens, obliged to defend themselves against the mad minority of revolutionaries, will exterminate these destroyers of civilization, and the multitude, disillusioned of Christianity, whose deist soul will up to that moment be without

compass, thirsting for an ideal, but not knowing where to bestow their worship, will receive the True Light, by the universal manifestation of the pure Luciferian doctrine, at last made public, a manifestation which will arise from the general movement of reaction following the destruction of Atheism and Christianity, both at the same time vanquished and exterminated."

Now this letter is at least as old as 1896 (if it is a forgery); if it is genuine, it is as old as 1871. It must therefore be considered remarkable, whether as a forgery or as a genuine document. For it predicts what has happened in Russia, and it claims for its authors that they were preparing to bring about what has happened.

If we compare more closely the words of the Masonic letter with what has actually happened in Russia, we cannot but see how close is the correspondence between the threats and the reality:

THE MASONIC LETTER.	MR. CHURCHILL'S DESCRIPTION.
. . . we shall unchain the revolutionary Nihilists and atheists, and we shall provoke a formidable social cataclysm . . . horror . . . savagery . . . the most bloody disorder.	. . . in the same way that you might send a phial . . . to tear to pieces every institution . . . long internal terrors . . . menaced by famine . . . sufferings more fearful than modern records hold.

Whatever explanation we may incline to give, we must at least allow that it is a document which is very difficult to explain. And there is this much to be said in support of it—that Mazzini certainly was connected (as we shall see) with the birth of that movement of "Revolutionary Nihilism" called the International.

One thing is certain: the motive suggested by Albert Pike for the destruction of Russia is not adequate. The cult of Adonaism, whatever that may be, and the hypothesis that the Pope might take refuge in Russia, would never have driven a body of conspirators to plot the destruction of Russia. But if the Charleston Lodge was, as it is generally supposed to be, very largely Jewish in origin and control, the motive becomes intelligible; it would lie in the hatred of the political Jew both for Russia and for Christianity.

CHAPTER V

THE intelligent reader may have surmised from our last chapter that Albert Pike's enigmatical passage may have had some connection with the founding of the International.

The history of that remarkable movement takes us back to the agitation which preceded the stormy years of 1848 and 1849. Benjamin Disraeli, in his *Coningsby*, written in 1844, testified beforehand that "that mighty Revolution which is at this moment preparing in Germany, and which will be, in fact, a second and greater Reformation, and of which so little is yet known in England, is developing entirely under the auspices of Jews."

And Disraeli was at least so far right that the two ablest heads in that movement were Jewish—Ferdinand Lassalle and Karl Marx.

Now as to these two men, there is one very remarkable coincidence which has never before been noticed. They were not only Jews; but they both, in their youth, dedicated their lives to revenge.

Ferdinand Lassalle (or Lassal) was born of Jewish parents at Breslau on April 11, 1825. In Breslau, it should be explained, the Jews were not emancipated until 1843. In his youth he kept a diary, and that diary (for the years 1840–1) was afterwards published by Paul Lindau.

In that diary (on February 1, 1840) Lassalle writes: "I think I am one of the best Jews in existence, although I disregard the ceremonial law. I could, like the Jew in Bulwer's *Leila*, risk my life to deliver the Jews from their present crushing condition." He speaks of his childish dream "to make the Jews armed—I at their head—free." And on July 30, 1840, commenting on certain accusations of ritual murder then being made against the Jews, he says:

" . . . the time will soon be at hand when we, in very deed, will help ourselves with Christian blood. *Aide-toi et le ciel t'aidera.* The dice are ready: it only depends upon the player."

So far Lassalle. Let us now turn to Marx.

In his *Karl Marx, His Life and Work*, John Spargo says that the true patronymic of the family seems to have been Mordechai. Mordechai, a grandfather of Karl Marx, was a rabbi: "one of a

long line of rabbis, unbroken from the sixteenth century until his son Heinrich, father of Karl Marx, adopted law instead of religion for a career. On his mother's side, also, Karl Marx had a long line of rabbinical ancestors." But in 1824, when Karl was six years old, Heinrich and his wife suddenly embraced Christianity, and they with their children were baptized. Mr. Spargo tries to make out that Heinrich forsook Judaism as a matter of conviction, but we can hardly credit such an explanation, and for the following reasons: At the time Heinrich adopted Christianity the Jews in the Rhine Province (the Marxes lived in Trier) were subject to extortion and mild persecution at the hands of the Prussian officials. The Code Napoleon of March 17, 1808, had been issued provisionally for a period of only ten years, and fixed the status of the Jews in the Rhine Province; and Heinrich Marx was a convinced disciple of that enemy of Christianity, Voltaire. Moreover, Liebknecht, long the intimate associate of Karl Marx, and himself a Jew and a revolutionary, says in his *Memoirs* that the acceptance of Christianity by the parents was compulsory, that it was due to an official edict by the Prussian Government compelling all Jews holding official

positions or engaged in the learned professions to forgo these or formally renounce Judaism. The same writer says that the boy Karl felt keenly this insult to his race, of which he was so proud, and that "*his whole life was a reply and a revenge.*"

Spargo and other biographers of Karl Marx naturally do not accept this explanation of their hero's activities, and do their best to discredit Liebknecht. But the story, despite their efforts, is, as we have seen, historically credible.

Here then we have a motive hitherto unsuspected by those Gentiles who follow the Red Banner—the motive of destroying the Christian nations in revenge for the wrongs of Judaism.

But to proceed. Karl Marx succeeded, by September 28, 1864, in founding the International Working Men's Association—inaugurated at St. Martin's Hall in London. In organizing this movement, Marx had considerable trouble with Giuseppe Mazzini, who had himself organized the Italian Working Men's Association, and desired to control the movement. Mazzini prepared a draft address, and presented it to the General Council of the International; but it was turned down in favour of another written by Marx, in much the same terms as the famous *Manifesto*. Mazzini

thereupon withdrew from the International, and for the rest of his life was a bitter opponent of Marx.

But Karl Marx was now to encounter a more formidable opponent than Mazzini. Michail Bakunin has been called the Russian Revolutionary Lion. He was, in fact, a Slav, and his gospel was a curious mixture of pan-Slavism and Anarchy. Part of his plan was to organize a great Slav Power to include all the Slav elements of Europe, and with this engine he designed to destroy not only the Russian Empire, but the German and Austrian Empires as well.

Now, we have no means of discovering the real motive behind these ideas. But that the inspiration was at least as much that of race as of class is evident. Bakunin bitterly denounced Karl Marx and his "clique of Jews"; Karl Marx as bitterly denounced Bakunin's pan-Slavism.

Can it be that the fight between Socialist and Anarchist veiled and covered another fight more fierce and instinctive—between Slav and Jew? Certain it is that Karl Marx's immediate plans did not include the destruction of the German Empire. Marx, despite his exile, had certain connections with the Prussian Government, and he used all his

influence in the International movement to weaken France and strengthen Germany in the Franco-Prussian War. But to return to the conflict.

Bakunin became a member of the International by joining the *Branche Romane* at Geneva. He immediately began his campaign to secure control of the entire movement. He formed within the International the *Alliance de la Démocratie Socialiste*, with a programme of its own and branches throughout Europe. When Marx got wind of this plot, he got the General Council of the International to denounce the Alliance as a scheme for disrupting the International. Bakunin capitulated, dissolved the Alliance, but immediately reorganized its branches as branches of the International! Marx said nothing, but at the Basle Congress of 1869 he got his friend Eccarius to propose that the Congress should give the General Council the power to expel any section contravening the principles of the association. To everybody's astonishment, Bakunin supported the motion. He thought that his supporters at the Congress outnumbered those of Marx, but he was wrong. He had still a long way to go before he finally overthrew his rival.

"Taking advantage," says Mr. John Spargo, in

his *Life of Karl Marx*, "of the situation in Europe which resulted from the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune, Bakunin went on building up his separate organization, the Alliance, especially in Italy and Spain. . . . Many of those who joined the Alliance had no idea that they were being used by Bakunin as a means of injuring the International." The struggle came to a head in September, 1872, when the International Congress met at The Hague. Marx had, at first, not intended to be present, but Bakunin had let it be known that he would attend for the purpose of "exposing Marx and his clique." Marx and Engels accepted the challenge. After a five days' word battle they routed Bakunin and prevented him from capturing the International, but to save their society from further molestation, they decided to remove their headquarters to New York. In 1876, the International was formally dissolved at a meeting held in Philadelphia.

These conflicts remain obscure; but they at least suggest an explanation of Albert Pike's enigmatical passage: "Masonry has not only been profaned; but it has served as a veil and a pretext for the plottings of Anarchy, by the secret influence of the avengers of Jacques de Molai."

Hitherto we have explored a dim subterranean twilight region by the candlelight of hints and surmises. We have not attempted to prove anything in the strict or even in the historical sense of that much abused word. No, we have merely attempted to indicate the probability of an organization of a secret order—a "terrible sect"—working for revolution in the world, and the other probability that this sect is controlled by Hebraic conspirators—not indeed orthodox Jews—who aspire to the dominion of the world.

That idea is not too vaguely indicated in a very remarkable passage of a book from which we have already quoted, the Abbé Joseph Lémann's *L'Entrée des Israélites dans la Société française*, which was published in 1886. There is a plan, says Lémann—a plan "*d'enfer*"—

"to disorganize at one blow Christian society, and the beliefs and customs of the Jews, then with this double organization to bring about a state of things where, religiously speaking, there will be neither Christian nor Jew, but only men stripped of divinity, *and where, politically speaking, the Christian will become, if not the slave, at least the inferior of the Jew, the master.* . . . At the hour in which we hold the pen we see this plan un-

rolling itself in sombre horizons and great funereal lines."

Now what does this passage suggest? It suggests that there is some formidable secret organization, some terrible sect, controlled and directed by Jews for the destruction of our present social order. It suggests also that these Jews are not orthodox Jews, but Jews who have freed themselves from the faith of their ancestors. And it suggests further that the design of these people is not merely anarchy but to create a world domination in which these infidel Jews are masters, and in which the Christian peoples are, if not their slaves, at least their inferiors.

Here, again, however, we are moving in a world of shadows, hints, and surmises, of "sombre horizons and funereal lines." The man of the world, who believes in nothing except what he finds proved, and who refuses to consider anything but a clear and precise statement, may be inclined to dismiss this passage as mere moonshine.

But now we are to emerge suddenly from shadows and moonshine into a fierce blaze of light. For we have now to consider a document which professes to set forth fully and plainly the plan of

campaign of this "formidable sect" for the destruction of the social order. Let us now consider what this document is.

In the year 1903 a Russian, Serge Nilus, published a book entitled *The Great in Little*. The second edition, which was published at Tsarskoe Selo in 1905, had an additional chapter, the twelfth, under the heading "Anti-Christ as a Near Political Possibility." This chapter consisted of some twenty pages of introduction followed by the text of twenty-four "Protocols of Meetings of the Learned Elders of Zion," and the book ends with some twenty pages of commentaries on these protocols by Nilus.

Directly after the protocols, comes a statement by Nilus that they are "signed by representatives of Zion of the thirty-third degree. These protocols were secretly extracted (or were stolen) from a whole volume of protocols. All this was got by my correspondent out of the secret depositories of the Head Chancellery of Zion. This Chancellery is at present on French territory." An English translation of these protocols has now been published (Eyre and Spottiswoode, 2s. 6d. net). This translation, which we have compared with the Russian 1905 edition in the British Museum, is

substantially correct, but in a work of such importance we have preferred to use our own translation.

Now the contention of Nilus is that these protocols are the plans of a secret organization or government of Jewry for the return of this organization or government to Zion, and for the government of the whole world by a Jewish dispensation. This plan, Nilus asserts, is not of yesterday but has been developed through many ages. What is usually understood by the Zionist movement, initiated at Basle in 1897, was not, it is said, a modern development of Jewry, but an indiscreet revelation of part of a plan long entertained. For that reason —*i.e.*, that the Zionist movement was a revelation to the world of secret designs—it was not regarded with favour by the real leaders nor by certain great Jewish capitalists. That indiscretion was committed by the impetuous Dr. Theodor Hertzl, a Vienna journalist and dramatic critic, who energetically brought forward to a world-wide public certain age-old plans of these secret leaders of Jewry.

The symbolism of the snake, says Nilus, typifies a coiling and encircling movement by which "all Europe, and through Europe all the rest of the world, by the use of all forms of force, by wars of

conquest, and by economic pressure, will be subjected to the influence of Jewry." "All the States," says Nilus, " passed over by the symbolic snake, not excluding Germany, with her apparent might, are in reality undermined by constitutional Liberalism and economic derangement. On the economic side, England and Germany are still spared, but only until such time as the irrevocable conquest of Russia, towards which all energies are now concentrated, has been accomplished. . . . Constantinople is the eighth and last stage towards Jerusalem."

We have said that this document flashes a blaze of light, and so it does, but whether this document is genuine or not, whether the blaze of light is true or false, can only be judged by internal evidence and probabilities. We may say at once that Nilus advances nothing in the nature of real evidence to prove the document, and that his account of how it came into his hands consists of assertion only, without evidence to support it. We can only say that if the document is not genuine it is a very extraordinary forgery, since it predicts with certainty not only the fact but the manner and mechanism of a great revolution before the event. Moreover, it says before the event that

this destruction will be carried out by a Jewish organization—a formidable sect—and such evidence as we have of the Russian Revolution confirms this prediction.

Thus, for example, Lieutenant-Colonel Malone, the Member of Parliament who went on a friendly visit to the Bolsheviks and returned in the latter part of 1919 to England, stated in the House of Commons on November 5th: "It is said openly that the Soviet Government is a Government of the Jews. Why, there are not in Lenin's Cabinet as many Jews or crypto-Jews as there are in any other Cabinet in Europe. There is only one—Trotsky. *Of course, there are Jews in control in Russia. There are Jews behind the commissars*, and there is no doubt that in Russia at this time the Jews are not subject to those horrible persecutions which they have endured for countless ages." And this is supported by numerous Christian refugees from Russia, who all assert that the chief actors in the Revolution are Jewish, and that the Jewish bourgeoisie have been spared by the revolutionaries.

Here, then, are two very remarkable pieces of corroborative evidence: first, that the document was published before the event which it predicted,

and, second, that those whom it states to be the conspirators are afterwards found to be the principal agents of the Revolution. We shall not begin the examination of the document itself at this stage of our inquiry, but we shall content ourselves merely with a quotation from Disraeli's novel *Coningsby*, which is well worth reading over again in the light of recent happenings. Those who know the novel will remember the mysterious character Sidonia, who describes himself as a Spanish Jew and an international power. He tells Coningsby how his ancestors had settled in Aragon before the Moorish invasion, how they had been persecuted and had adopted the veil of Christianity, remaining Jews in secret, how they had betrayed Spain to the Moors, and how they had again been persecuted when Ferdinand and Isabella re-established Christian domination, how they had again disguised themselves as Christians, but how as soon as their descendants had reached England, he had set up the Mosaic altar. He refers to his tutor, Rebello—"a Jesuit before the Revolution, since then an exiled Liberal leader, now a member of the Spanish Cortes; Rebello was always a Jew." He refers also to "the subterranean agency of which the world in general knows so

little, but which exercises so great an influence on public events." And he proceeds, "You never observe a great intellectual movement in Europe in which the Jews do not greatly participate. The first Jesuits were Jews; that mysterious Russian diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe is organized and practically carried on by Jews; that mighty Revolution which is at this moment preparing in Germany, and which will be in fact a second and greater Reformation, and of which so little is yet known in England, is developing entirely under the auspices of Jews."

CHAPTER VI

WE have given some account of the extraordinary document printed by the Russian Nilus in the year 1905 as an appendix to his book. That document consists of twenty-four protocols, running to about thirty thousand words. In form, as we have said, it takes the shape of a series of lectures "at the meetings of the learned elders of Zion." The lecturer speaks sometimes as if the initiates whom he was addressing were the secret government of the Jews and sometimes as if they were the heads of a Jewish Masonic organization. The general object of the conspiracy which the protocols discussed is the government of the world by a king of the blood of David. How that end is to be secured we shall see as we proceed, and we gather that Masonry is used by the organization as a cloak and a veil. Thus, for example, in Protocol 4 we find the passage:

"Who and what is in a position to overthrow an invisible force? And this is precisely what our

force is. Exterior Masonry blindly serves as a screen for us and our objects, but the plan of action of our force, even its very abiding-place, remain for the whole people an unknown mystery."

But here we come to a very clear distinction. The speaker constantly refers with infinite contempt to what he calls the *goyim* or Gentiles, the Christian and non-Jewish peoples of the world; and he mentions an inner or Jewish Masonry, the true governing power, and an outer or Gentile Masonry, which blindly follows the lead of a direction it does not suspect. Thus, for example, in Protocol 11:

"For what purpose, then, have we invented this whole policy and insinuated it into the minds of the *goyim* (Gentiles) without giving them any chance to examine its underlying meaning? For what, indeed, if not to obtain in a roundabout way what is for our scattered tribes unattainable by a direct road? It is this which has served as the basis for our organization of secret Masonry, which is unknown to, and has aims which are not even so much as suspected by, these *goyim*-cattle, attracted by us into the 'show' army of Masonic Lodges in order to throw dust into the eyes of their fellows."

When at last the final Revolution comes, Masonry is to be brought to an end as having served its purpose. "Those Gentile Masons who know too much" are either to be banished or kept under constant fear of exile. In the meantime, Masonry is to be organized and directed as a weapon against Church and State in accordance with their plan.

This plan is not new. It is followed from generation to generation. Thus, for example, in Protocol 1 we find:

"Before us is a plan in which is laid down strategically the line from which we cannot deviate without running the risk of seeing the labour of many centuries brought to nought."

In pursuance of this plan they brought about the French Revolution. "Far back in ancient times," says the first protocol, "we were the first to cry among the masses of the people the words 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.'"

"In all corners of the earth, the words 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. And all the time these words were cankerworms at work boring into the

well-being of the *goyim*, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity, and destroying all the foundations of the *goyim* States. As you will see later, this helped us to our triumph: it gave us the possibility, among other things of getting into our hands the master card—the destruction of the privileges, or, in other words, of the very existence of the aristocracy of the *goyim*, that class which was the only defence peoples and countries had against us. On the ruins of the natural and genealogical aristocracy of the *goyim*, we have set up the aristocracy of our educated class, headed by the aristocracy of money. The qualifications for this aristocracy we have established in wealth, which is dependent upon us, and in knowledge, for which our learned elders provide the motive force."

And, again, we find in Protocol 3 a definite claim:

"Remember the French Revolution, to which it was we who gave the name of 'Great.' The secrets of its preparation are well known to us, for it was wholly the work of our hands."

But not only does the speaker claim for his organization the authorship of the French Revolution. He states also that the liberal and constitutional movements which have agitated Europe and have weakened the authority of government

have been set going in the same way and for the same purpose.

"The word 'Liberty' brings out the communities of men to fight against every kind of force, against every kind of authority, even against God and the laws of nature. For this reason we, when we come into our kingdom, shall have to erase this word from the lexicon of life as implying a principle of brute force which turned mobs into blood-thirsty beasts."

He boasts that by means of Liberalism and Constitutionalism they had destroyed the power of Kings, and especially of the aristocracy, to protect the people. "The people," he says, "under our guidance, have annihilated the aristocracy, who were their one and only defence and foster-mother, for the advantage of the aristocracy is inseparably bound up with the well-being of the people." The result of the destruction of the aristocracy is that the people have fallen into the grip of merciless money-getting scoundrels who have laid a pitiless yoke upon the neck of the workers.

Having effected so much by Liberalism they then come forward as "saviours of the worker," and propose to the workers that they should "enter the ranks of our fighting forces—Socialists. An-

archists, Communists, to whom we always give support."

Besides these secret powers, the organization has another power, the power of gold. "In our hands is the greatest power of our day—gold. In two days we can procure from our storehouses any quantity we please."

With command of capital the organization has the power to create financial and industrial crises, and as a means of bringing off the last and greatest revolution there is to be a great financial crisis which will reduce the workers to the verge of starvation and make them ripe for the most desperate acts.

"We shall raise the rate of wages, which, however, will not bring any advantage to the workers, for at the same time we shall produce a rise in prices of the first necessaries of life."

"In order that the true meaning of things may not strike the Gentiles before the proper time, we shall mask it under an alleged ardent desire to serve the working classes, and the great principles of political economy about which our economic theorists are carrying on an energetic propaganda."

We have given a general account of these protocols published by Nilus in 1905. Let us now ex-

amine them more in detail. The first protocol begins, as it were, in the middle of a sentence:

". . . Putting aside fine phrases, we shall speak of the significance of each thought: by comparisons and deductions we shall throw light upon surrounding facts. . . . It must be noted that men with bad instincts are more in number than the good, and therefore the best results in governing them are attained by violence and terror, and not by academic discussions."

After the assertion that every man aims at power and most would sacrifice the general good for their own welfare, there follows the statement:

"Political freedom is an idea but not a fact. This idea one must know how to use as a bait to attract the masses of the people so as to crush those in authority. This task is the easier if the opponent himself has been infected with the idea of Liberty or Liberalism, and for the sake of an idea is willing to yield some of his power. It is precisely here that the triumph of our theory appears: the slackened reins of government are immediately, by the law of life, caught up and gathered together by a new hand, because the blind might of the nation cannot for a single day exist without guidance and the new authority

merely fits into the place of the old already weakened by Liberalism."

The lecturer points out that this doctrine is no more immoral than the doctrine of foreign war, that "the political has nothing in common with the moral," that frankness and honesty are vices in politics, "for they bring down rulers from their thrones more certainly than the most powerful enemy," and that right lies in force.

"In any state in which there is a bad organization of authority, an impersonality of laws and of rulers who have lost their personality amid the flood of rights that are multiplying out of Liberalism I find a new right—to attack by the right of the strong and to scatter to the winds all existing forces of order and regulation, to reconstruct all institutions, and to become the sovereign lord of those who have left to us the rights of their power by laying them down voluntarily in their Liberalism. Our power in the present tottering of all forms of power will be more invincible than any other, because it will remain invisible until the moment when it has gained such strength that no cunning can any longer undermine it."

There follows a justification of "the programme of violence and make-believe," and of the use of

hands. It speaks also of their international agents with their "millions of eyes ever on the watch"; it boasts that "we shall choose from among the public administrators with strict regard to their capacities for servile obedience"; that these persons will not be trained in the arts of government, and that therefore they will easily become "pawns in our game—in the hands of our men of learning and genius, bred and reared from early childhood to rule the affairs of the whole world."

The second protocol ends with the boast that "the Press has fallen into our hands"; and again, "through the Press we have gained a power to influence while remaining ourselves in the shade."

Thus these two opening protocols express a philosophy of government more cynical than Machiavelli's, and they make also the disturbing claim that Liberalism and Modernism, if not created by the Jews, have been used by them as the means of misleading Christian nations and destroying their power of self-defence.

CHAPTER VII

THE third protocol opens with these very remarkable words: "Today I may tell you that our goal is now only a few steps off. There remains a small space to cross, and the long path we have trodden is ready to close in circle of the Snake by which we symbolize our people. When this ring closes all the States of Europe will be locked in its coils as in a vice.

"The constitutional scales of these days will shortly break down, for we have given them a certain lack of accurate balance in order that they may oscillate incessantly until they wear through the pivot on which they turn. The *goyim* believe that they have made them sufficiently strong, and keep on expecting that the scales will come into equilibrium. But the pivot, the kings on their thrones, are hemmed in by their representatives, who play the fool, distraught with their own uncontrolled and irresponsible power. This power they owe to the terror which has breathed into the palaces. . . . We have made a gulf between the

far-seeing Sovereign Power and the blind force of the people, so that both have lost all meaning, for, like the blind man and the stick, both are powerless apart."

After boasting of the means by which the "elders of Zion" have instilled class hatred into the people, the protocol continues:

"This hatred will be still further magnified by the effect of an economic crisis, which will stop dealings on the exchanges and bring industry to a standstill. We shall create by all the secret subterranean methods open to us, and with the aid of gold, which is all in our hands, a universal economic crisis, whereby we shall throw upon the streets whole mobs of workers simultaneously in all the countries of Europe. These mobs will rush with delight and shed the blood of those whom, in the simplicity of their ignorance, they have envied from their cradles, and whose property they will then be able to loot.

"Ours they will not touch, because the moment of attack will be known to us, and we shall take measures to protect our own."

Such, then, is the plan of the "elders of Zion," and in the succeeding protocols they elaborate the means by which it is to be brought about. Thus, for example, by attack upon religion:

"It is indispensable for us to undermine all faith, tear out of the minds of the *goyim* the very principle of Godhead and the Spirit, and to put in its place arithmetical calculations and material needs."

There are several passages which seem to suggest the League of Nations, as, for example:

"By all these means we shall so wear down the *goyim* that they will be compelled to offer us international power of such a nature as will enable us without any violence gradually to absorb all the great forces of the world and to form a supergovernment. In place of the rulers of today we shall set up a bogey which will be called the Super-Government Administration. Its tentacles will reach out in all directions and its organization will be so colossal as to subdue all the nations of the world."

Education, politics, law, the theatre, are all discussed as means of creating revolutions, and throughout there breathes a spirit of almost indescribable hate for the Christian nations, as, for example, in such a sentence as this, from Protocol 11:—"The *goyim* are a flock of sheep and we are their wolves."

But it is only fair to say of this extraordinary

document that while half of it is devoted to the destruction of the present order, the latter half of the document gives an outline of a new order, an order of world government in the hands of the sect.

These "elders of Zion" are by no means anarchists. On the contrary, they make it quite clear that they only use anarchy as a means to an end, and that they thoroughly believe in the natural divisions of society into classes and in the benefits of a strong Government. The Government is not to be a free Government—they propose, indeed, to erase the very word of liberty from the languages of the world—nor will it permit equality of races. The Gentile "cattle" are to work for their Jewish masters without any hope of liberation. But it is to be a just and orderly Government. Great attention is given to the reform of the law and of the judiciary. The King is to be very carefully chosen from among the descendants of the Royal House of David. If he shows weakness or vice he is to be replaced by another, and everything is to be done to make him popular with the people. Of the value of prestige the lecturer makes a special study; and there are detailed instructions as to the use of the Press and the organization of the police.

The system of education is calculated to wipe out of the minds of the *goyim* any recollections of their former state. In religion atheism is only to be tolerated during the time of revolution; when it has done its work, the Jewish religion is to be established as the universal faith. By such means the speaker believes that they will be able to produce a tranquil world:

"The errors of the Gentile Governments will be depicted by us in the most vivid hues. We shall implant such an abhorrence of them that the peoples will prefer tranquillity in a state of serfdom to those rights of vaunted freedom which have tortured humanity and exhausted the very sources of human existence. . . . Useless changes of forms of government to which we instigated the *goyim* when we were undermining their State structures will have so wearied the peoples by that time that they will prefer to suffer anything under us rather than run the risk of enduring again all the agitations and miseries they have gone through." (Protocol No. 14.)

The final protocols become ecstatic in their enthusiasm for the new order. Before it comes they are to sweep away all those forces of anarchy and revolutionary Masonry by which they have

prepared its entrance, so that in its path be left "no knot, no splinter." And again:

"Then will it be possible for us to say to the peoples of the world: Give thanks to God and bow the knee before him who bears on his front the seal of the predestination of man, to whom God himself has led His star that none other except him might free us from all the before-mentioned forces and evils."

The following internal evidence is available as to the authenticity of the protocols. We know about Serge Nilus, who gave them to the world, little more than that he was a Russian of good family and repute. He may be alive or he may be dead. As to his comments on the protocols and his account of how he came to print them, we have no evidence beyond his own word that he is telling the truth.

There is, however, one undoubted fact upon which to build, and that is the date at which these protocols were given to the world. Fortunately that is set beyond doubt by the existence of a copy of the 1905 edition in the British Museum.

From what we can gather from Russians who have sought refuge in this country, the book made

little or no impression when it appeared. Some of them allege that the whole edition except a few copies was bought up by the Russian Jews, but it is, of course, impossible to prove such an allegation. It is certain that the warning contained in these protocols was disregarded—their significance was not suspected. It was only when the Revolution fulfilled them in spirit and in letter that their importance was realized. And now they are in the mouth of every Russian. They all believe them genuine, by evidence which they at least regard as unassailable. "The proof of the pudding lies in the eating."

As to the date on which the protocols were delivered we have the assertion of Nilus that they were known to the Zionist Congress at Basle. That Congress brings us to the date 1897. But there is no evidence in the document that its authors have any concern with the Zionist movement; indeed, their project of a universal domination might appear to render Zionism unnecessary.

From one bombastic reference to the possibility of blowing up the capitals of Europe by laying mines in the underground railways we see that the document is, at all events, modern. There is besides one reference to a living European states-

man, a statesman prominently concerned with Freemasonry, secular education, and the League of Nations, who is described as "one of our best agents." There is also this curious reference:

"In order that our scheme may produce this result we shall arrange elections in favour of such presidents as have in their past some dark undiscovered stain, some 'Panama' or other . . . then they will be trustworthy agents for the accomplishment of our plans out of fear of revelations."

The first Panama Company, it may be remembered, became bankrupt in 1889, and the scandal occupied the French public in the decade which followed.

There is no reference to England in the protocols, the nearest approach being a statement by Nilus himself that the protocols were shown, among others, to a very wealthy and influential British Jew, now dead. But for this statement there is, of course, no evidence in the protocols themselves.

So much then for the date. The protocols must have been delivered or written at some time between 1889 and 1905.

Now it must be considered evidence—not conclusive, certainly, but very strong—that at that

date there was foreknowledge or prediction of the great revolutionary movement which is now taking place. The means by which it was to be brought about, wars, the rise in prices, the corruption of governments, and the use of Jewish agents, all apply to the revolution in Russia, and to the attempted revolutions in Germany and Hungary. It is known, for example, that the two Spartacist leaders in Germany were Jews, that Bela Kun, Szamuelly, and in fact nearly every one of the Hungarian revolutionaries were Jews, and there is universal testimony by all Christian refugees from Russia that the Soviet Commissaries, almost to a man, are Jews. Lenin is one of the few prominent figures not Jewish, but even Lenin is said to be married to a Jewess.

In any event it is plain from the protocols that the leader of anarchy is not the King of Zion to whom they refer. He only leads the way and must himself be swept aside so that there may be not a splinter in the path of the King of the House of David. In the fourth protocol the course of a revolution is very accurately described: "In the early days mad raging by the blind mob . . . the second demagogy, from which is born anarchy, and that leads inevitably to despotism."

Apparently not only Russia but the whole world must pass through these stages before the King of Zion is proclaimed.

In the meantime it is at least clear, as Colonel Malone admitted, that Jews are behind the Revolution in Russia, and that is what, after all, the protocols claim.

As to the several references to "our international super-government," these may or may not refer to the League of Nations, but it is my contention that such a government will play into the hands of the international Jews, and will weaken the sovereignty of nations.

The boastful and bombastic character of the protocols remind us rather strikingly of those passages in Disraeli's *Coningsby* which claim for the Jews the control of European affairs, both on the revolutionary and conservative side. If these documents are genuine, this boastfulness is a crumb of comfort to the Christian peoples, since pride proverbially goeth before a fall.

There is no doubt, however, that the Jews have a right to claim a very considerable influence in the movement of thought generally called "Modernism," or in politics "Liberalism." We have seen how Lémann asserted that the Jews who worked

for this movement in Germany before the Revolution were themselves faithful to the national or tribal principle of Judaism. We must, therefore, suppose that these Jews embraced Modernism, not for itself, but as a means of weakening Christian nations.

In this connection it is noteworthy that at the universal conference of the Jews held at Leipsic in 1869, when the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* was founded, the following resolution was proposed by Dr. Philippson, of Bonn, seconded by Astrup, Chief Rabbi of Belgium, and adopted with acclamation:

"The Synod recognizes that the development and realization of modern principles are the most certain guarantees of the present and the future of Judaism and its members. They are the most energetically vital conditions for the expansive existence and the most high development of Judaism."

It seemed to some democrats then a little humiliating that their universal movement should be claimed as serving the cause of a particular nationalism; but if the apparently innocent resolution of 1869 has been translated into these terrible

protocols of world revolution, the modern world must feel not merely humiliation, but horror.

So much then for the internal evidence on its broad lines, the correspondence, that is to say, between the known activities of political and revolutionary Jewry and the claims of these protocols. We might sum up the case for their genuineness in the shrewd words of Abraham Lincoln:

"When we see a lot of frame timber different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance —and when we see these timbers framed together and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill—or if a single piece be lacking, we see the piece in the frame exactly fitted and prepared, yet to bring such piece in—in such a case we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck."

At the same time, we must in fairness state our belief that if the document be genuine, it ought certainly not to be regarded as an indictment of all

Jews, but of that section which, under a veil of Masonry and through the revolutionary parties among the Gentiles, works for ends kept secret no doubt from the majority of Jews themselves.

CHAPTER VIII

WE have now passed these protocols in general review. We have summarized their contents. We have pointed out that the document, as far as we know, cannot be "proved" in any legal sense. For the manner in which it was obtained and for its authorship alike there is the testimony of but one man—the Russian Nilus.

And if we consider the internal evidence fairly it amounts to this: that the document predicts a world revolution, and a world revolution carried out by a Jewish organization, and that the revolution now in progress—the Bolshevist Revolution—is in fact carried on mainly by Jews, and is an attempt at a world revolution.

There we must leave it. If our readers believe that such a prophecy could have been made without foreknowledge by some anti-Semitic fanatic, then, of course, they will not accept the document as genuine. If, on the other hand, they believe that such a hypothesis is untenable, then there is

only the alternative that the document is genuine. If they believe the former they may sleep comfortably in their beds; if they believe the latter then they must regard the document as a very serious warning of a very terrible menace. They will, however, have this comfort—to be forewarned is to be forearmed.

But before we leave this subject there is one side of the question which we must consider more fully, and that is the passages in these protocols which refer to Freemasonry. The main passage occurs in Protocol 15:

"We shall create and multiply Freemasonic lodges in all the countries of the world, absorb in them all who are or who may become prominent in public activity, for in these lodges we shall find our principal intelligence office and means of influence. All these lodges we shall bring under one central administration known to us alone and to all others absolutely unknown, which will be composed of our Learned Elders. The lodges will have their representatives, who will serve to screen this central administration, and from whom will issue the watchword and programme. In these lodges we shall tie the knot which binds together all revolutionary and liberal elements."

Now, the attentive reader will connect this passage with certain other passages curiously similar which we have quoted in the course of these pages. There was, for example, the passage from Louis Blanc's *History of the French Revolution:*

"They created occult lodges reserved for ardent souls . . . shadowy sanctuaries whose doors were only open to the adept after a long series of proofs calculated to test the progress of their revolutionary education."

They will remember, also, that remarkable passage from Albert Pike's *Masonic Ritual:*

"Masonry has not only been profaned, but it has even served as a veil and pretext for the plottings of anarchy, by the secret influence of the avengers of Jacques de Molai."

They will remember, also, the passage quoted from the same author's *Ritual of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States:*

"My brother, you desire to unite yourself to an Order which has laboured in silence and secrecy for more than five hundred years with a single end in view, and hitherto with only partial success—

that what you are now engaged in . . . will expose you to danger, and that this Order means to deal with the affairs of nations and be once more a power in the world."

These words, let it be remembered, are part of the ritual of an Order of Freemasonry known to have been chiefly founded by Jews, and suspected of being still largely under Jewish influence.

We might carry our quotations further. The Grand Orient of France is generally believed to be under Hebraic influence. On April 2, 1889, the Grand Orient issued a circular which contained these words:

"Masonry, which prepared the Revolution of 1789, has the duty to continue its work."

Again, these protocols speak of the destruction of religion as a means of undermining society. Let us see what the Grand Orient says of religion:

"The triumph of the Galilean," says the President of the Grand Orient, Senator Delpech, on September 20, 1902, "has lasted twenty centuries. But now He dies in His turn. The mysterious voice announcing (Julian the Apostate) the death of Pan today announces the death of the imposter

God, Who promised an era of justice and peace to those who believed in Him. Masons, we rejoice to state that we are not without our share in this overthrow of the false prophets."

Of these passages at least there is no doubt at all, for they are taken from the official literature of the Grand Orient. Let the reader decide for himself whether they are the mere vapourings of fanatical atheists or a part of the design of world revolution outlined in the protocols.

But the protocols asserted that they intended to multiply Freemasonic lodges as a preliminary to revolution. What is actually being done? We know that English Masonry generally is non-political and loyal to British institutions. If therefore these conspirators are carrying out their plan in this country it must be by the introduction into England of the Oriental or Scottish Orders of Masonry, that is to say, Masonry of the revolutionary type.

Now in the year 1893 a French lodge called *Les Libres Penseurs* constituted itself into *La Grande Loge Symbolique Ecossaise de France, Le Droit Humain.* One of the peculiarities of this Order was that it admitted women as well as men,

and the movement has come to be known as Co-Masonry. And with this Co-Masonry was curiously mingled the cult of Theosophy. Those who have studied the movement find that the leading lights of Theosophy are usually members of the Co-Masonic lodges.

But to proceed. In 1900, this new Grand Lodge transformed itself into a Supreme Council of the Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite.

There are now a hundred lodges working under the Supreme Council, and they are to be found in France, Belgium, England, Scotland, India, Holland, Java, Switzerland, Norway, South Africa, and South America. Those lodges of this Order which use the English language have a subsidiary Council of their own, but are nevertheless an integral part of the Continental Order. On the Council of the 33d Degree there are three English Co-Masons out of the total of nine, so that the British representatives are outnumbered by two to one.

It is hardly necessary to say that this movement is not recognized by the Grand Lodge of England, which has cut off all relations with the Grand Orient of France on the ground of its atheism and also of its subversive political tendencies. But the

original French members of the Co-Masonic movement were too advanced even for the revolutionary Grand Orient of Paris.

As we have said, the British Co-Masonic lodges have a special Grand Council, and in England they have restored the Bible and the name of God to their ritual. . But six members of the Grand Council are carefully selected from above, and the representatives of the lower degrees are in a hopeless minority on the Council, while the Council itself is subject to the control of the 33d Degree sitting in Paris. Thus no new lodges can be founded without the sanction of the Supreme Council of Paris, and the petition must first be endorsed by the Council of England. It will thus be seen that this Co-Masonic organization has been very carefully thought out, and that its activities are subject to the control of an unseen hand in Paris.

Now we do not allege that all the members of the Co-Masonic movement are conspirators. On the contrary, we believe that many of them are either honest enthusiasts or "those light-minded people" to whom the protocols so contemptuously refer. What we do suggest is that the movement was probably inaugurated and may probably be directed to revolutionary ends.

We do not propose for the moment to say anything more of this Co-Masonic movement except this, that while some of its members seem to be respectable and innocent people, some others who are connected with it and who help to promote it are known also to be connected with the revolutionary and seditious movements which have recently disturbed and, indeed, endangered the British Empire. Of that we possess proofs. In the meantime we would confine ourselves to warning the public of both sexes to beware of such movements. They are put before them in an alluring form, but those who join them may discover too late that they are "the shadowy sanctuaries of revolution."

It may now be useful to summarize what has gone before and also to make some general remarks upon the nature and effects of revolution. Our summary, then, is, first, that in all the revolutionary movements we have examined there are plain traces of design, and there is evidence also that this design is common to all revolutionary movements. In the second place, we have seen that certain Orders of Freemasonry have been active in this design, and that they have always been inspired by the same ferocious hatred of

Christian Church and National State. And in the third place we have observed that a certain type of "advanced" or political Jews have been active, both in the Masonic organizations and in the revolutions themselves. They have not, it is true, led the forlorn hopes; they are seldom to be seen either on the barricades or on the scaffold, but they lurk behind, active and energetic in intrigue, and giving the impression of a purposeful activity.

We have seen how the Abbé Lémann, himself by race a Jew, was careful to distinguish between the advanced, or political, Jew, who nourished great ambitions for himself and for his race, but who had liberated himself from his religion, and the mass of Jews who are content to remain good citizens of the country of their adoption and satisfy the ideal side of their nature with the religion of their ancestors.

We may take it, then, that these ardent political spirits dream a political dream which is a modern development of the Messianic prophecies, and that they have also in their blood a traditional and racial hatred for the Christian nations which in ages past have not treated their people too well. We see this hatred in the realm of Jewish thought, in the revolutionary system of Alexander Hercen,

the intellectual founder of Russian anarchy, in the explosive economics of Lassalle and Karl Marx, and in the passionate dreams of Heine. Heine gloats over the prospect of the "German thunder that is coming slowly but will come—when you hear an uproar such as there never was in history, know then that the German thunderbolt has struck its mark . . . the Germans will then stage a play in comparison with which the French Revolution was but an idyll." And, again, in his prediction of the rôle of Russia—"We do not mind a little slavery more or less, for through Russia we shall be liberated from the remains of feudalism and clericalism."[1]

And, lastly, we have found that all these elements come together in a revolutionary propaganda both Semitic and Masonic, which has been, as a fact, behind revolutionary movements both in the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, and probably also in the eighteenth century.

We arrive at these conclusions altogether independently of the Nilus book, a book the credibil-

[1] These quotations from Heine are taken from an extremely interesting article by the Count de Soissons on the Jews as a revolutionary leaven in the January, 1920, number of the *Quarterly Review*.

ity of which rests, as we have said, entirely upon internal evidence.

If these conclusions are well founded, a revolution is not the result of what we might call spontaneous social combustion but the result of design. Yet there is this caution to be made: a house does not spontaneously ignite, but it will burn fiercely if its materials are dry, combustible, and rotten. It will probably not catch fire at all if it is built of fireproof material and is inhabited by people who take proper precautions against fire. So with a nation; the social organization cannot be fanned into the flames of revolution, no matter what secret societies are at work, unless the conditions are favourable to revolution. The conditions favourable to revolution have been diagnosed by statesmen and by historians. They are not, properly speaking, the business of these papers, which was simply to look for the incendiary design, not to devise a fireproof house. Yet nevertheless we may suggest briefly the causes which predispose to revolution in all ages and in all nations. Wars certainly, and in particular unsuccessful wars, which leave soldiers unemployed, and produce in men a fitness for desperate deeds, are one cause. Bad trade, which throws men upon the streets

and leaves them idle and ripe for mischief, which makes thousands of men think that any change is better than present conditions—that is another cause. We shall find if we look into it that practically every revolution is preceded by a period of bad trade and unemployment. Bad harvests and scarcity of food, producing hunger and envy in the masses of the people, are another cause. Party rivalries and factions in the State, producing bands of men at enmity with the presiding Government, and willing to bring it down for their own purposes —these certainly constitute another cause. The character of the Government itself, whether it suppresses too much the common liberties of the nation, or, on the other side, is too indulgent with treason and crime, or, again, is inspired by impracticable ideals which bring the State to disaster—here we have still another cause of revolution. And extravagant ideas in the minds of the people, whether of liberty so great that it injures others, or of wealth so easy that it resembles plunder, these, too, may induce to revolution.

Moreover, it has happened in history that an astute and unscrupulous ruler, as, for example, Frederick the Great, may promote a revolution in a neighbouring country for his own purposes, by

propaganda and by what we now call peaceful penetration.

Certainly a country well governed by respected rulers, whose industries are prosperous, and whose subjects are reasonably happy, is the sort of national house that does not readily take fire. It is for our statesmen to consider whether England is at present in this case.

When all or any such disturbing conditions exist, then the wreckers work, then the shadowy sanctuaries of revolution become busy, and the people ripe for trouble are persuaded on every hand that their ills can be redressed by the destruction of society.

It is a terrible fallacy. A nation, and especially a modern nation, is a highly complex system of life. It has grown, it has developed, and it exists by the intricate interaction of millions of parts one with another. Russia was a country which of all countries in Europe could best stand a revolution, for its industrial organization was comparatively low. Ninety per cent. of the people lived on the land in a manner almost self-contained. They could live, although the machinery of modern industrialism was brought to a stand. Yet even in Russia the inhabitants of the great towns and the

middle and upper classes, all essential to the national life, have been almost altogether destroyed, except those aliens who were able to come to terms with the "terrible sect." The population of great cities has in many cases almost disappeared. Whole classes have been either destroyed or have fled the country. But consider the situation of such a country as England in a revolution, where less than half the people live upon the land, and more than half depend upon great intricate industries in which they are all specialists, and the profits of which buy for them all their necessities. Let us consider, too, that in this country most of our food does not come from the farm in the country cart, but by ship and railway from great distances and from foreign countries. If the industrial machinery is brought to a stop, if the carrying machinery is paralyzed even for a fortnight, more than half the nation is deprived of the means of existence. As individuals they are helpless; they must starve. If they rush the shops and plunder the warehouses, if they rob their richer neighbours and forage through the country in plundering hordes, they may exist a little while longer, but the end is no less inevitable. In any revolution which was really successful from the point of view of the

revolutionaries, that is to say, in any revolution which paralyzed what is called the capitalistic organization by which we live, at least half and probably three quarters of the population would die of starvation. Let us not say that it cannot happen because it has not happened so far. If a revolution occurs it must happen.

France was comparatively fortunate in the Reign of Terror, because her population at that time was chiefly agricultural, yet it is certain that a large part of the population died, whether by massacre or by starvation. Prudhomme estimates that the death-roll in France during the Terror, including losses through civil war, was 1,025,711. In Nancy alone, by the guillotine, shooting, and wholesale drownings and by pestilence, 32,000 people lost their lives. Taine says that there were nearly half a million victims of the Terror in the eleven provinces of the west alone. We now know that the revolutionaries saw clearly that the population could not continue to exist, and were determined to reduce it. Courtois, in his report on the papers seized at Robespierre's house, speaks of a plan to annihilate twelve or fifteen millions of the French people. One of the Illuminati, Gracchus Babeuf, said that depopulation was indispensable.

Prudhomme asserts that the Terror was part of a plan of depopulation conceived by Marat and Robespierre. Carrier, one of the instruments of the Terror, said: "Let us make a cemetery of France rather than not regenerate her after our manner." Jean Bon Saint-André is reported (by Larevellière-Lépeaux) to have asserted that in order to establish the Republic securely in France, the population must be reduced by more than one half.

And these massacres were indiscriminate. Modern analyses of the names of the victims show that they were not chiefly aristocrats, but were drawn in the main from among poor and obscure people, small shopkeepers. Of the 1366 victims of the Great Terror in Paris, the largest proportion was either from the middle or the working classes. Hundreds of working men and working women were guillotined for reasons that cannot now be ascertained. It is probable that many of them were denounced out of panic, and many others for reasons of blackmail. People killed in order not to be killed, and the tribunal demanded victims at the rate of so many a day in order to overawe those who remained.

Such things take place when the social order is

in dissolution, when criminals and fanatics usurp the place of Government. And there is another terror added. For the enemies of a nation in revolution take the opportunity of attacking it, and invasion and internal war complete the destruction. No nation can without a terrible catastrophe destroy its social and industrial order and its national discipline.

CHAPTER IX

"WANT and opinion are the two agents which make all men act. Cause the want, govern the opinions, and you will overturn all the existing systems, however well consolidated they may appear." That maxim of revolutionary Freemasonry quoted by the Abbé Barruel in his *Memoirs of Jacobinism*, towards the end of the eighteenth century, epitomizes the strange creed whose evolution has been traced. The inferences to be drawn from those mysterious pronouncements, beginning with the foundation of the Illuminati in Bavaria in 1776, down to the publication of the now famous Protocols of Meetings of the "Learned Elders of Zion" in 1905 by the Russian, Serge Nilus, are that for a long period of time a conspiracy has been gradually developing for the overthrowing of the existing Christian form of civilization, that the prime agents of that conspiracy were Jews and revolutionary Freemasons, and that its object, which it is claimed is now near fruition, is to pave the way

for the world supremacy of a chosen people. We do not profess to be able to substantiate these inferences; all we can do is to draw attention to some of the great forces which in recent years have been moulding government and opinion and to see if they bear any resemblance in themselves and in their effects to the dreams and schemes fashioned by these eager and determined fanatics.

Now, the first point which must strike any student of world movements at the present moment is that men are certainly acting. Indeed, compared with the ceaseless activities both in thought and action of the men of today, our forefathers were men who merely slept. Daring revolutionary ideals, daring revolutionary movements, are sweeping the world either towards a new heaven or towards the abyss—it depends upon one's point of view. Men, indeed, are acting, and the forces which are moving them are want and opinion! Strikes follow one another all over the world with the rapidity and concerted action of waves beating upon a shore, and the strikers proclaim that driven by want they are out for large increases in wages. In that connection it is worth quoting again a sentence from the Protocols:

"We shall raise the rate of wages, which, however, will not bring any advantage to the workers, for at the same time we shall produce a rise in prices of the first necessaries of life."

So much for want. And as for opinion, great masses of men of different nationality, race, religion, class, and profession are in these days swayed and driven and almost consumed by a new gospel which boldly bids for the place held throughout the Christian era by the old. This gospel is Bolshevism. It is derived primarily from the beatitudes pronounced by the Jew, Karl Marx, and its present fountain head is Moscow. Bolshevism is openly anti-Christian and revolutionary. It seeks to abolish property, to found the dictatorship of the proletariat, to place the world under an international control. Now nearly all the Bolshevik leaders are Jews. That is a fact of tremendous significance. Here is a list, the result of much labour, and the work of several hands, which gives the pseudonyms, the real names, and the racial origin of fifty persons who either are the actual governing powers in Soviet Russia, now or were responsible for the establishment there of the present *régime*:

Pseudonym.	Real Name.	Race.
1. Lenin	Oulianov	Russian
2. Trotsky	Bronstein	Jew
3. Steklov	Nachamkess	Jew
4. Martov	Tsederbaum	Jew
5. Zinoviev	Apfelbaum	Jew
6. Goussiev	Drapkin	Jew
7. Kamenev	Rosenfeld	Jew
8. Souhanov	Ghimmer	German
9. Sagersky	Krachmann	Jew
10. Bogdanov	Silberstein	Jew
11. Gorev	Goldman	Jew
12. Ouritzky	Radomislsky	Jew
13. Volodarsky	Kohen	Jew
14. Sverdlov	Sverdlov	(?) Jew
15. Kamkov	Katz	Jew
16. Ganetzky	Furstenberg	Jew
17. Dann	Gourevitch	Jew
18. Meshkovsky	Goldberg	Jew
19. Parvus	Helphandt	Jew
20. Riazanov	Goldenbach	Jew
21. Martinov	Zimbar	Jew
22. Tchernomorsky	Tchernomordik	Jew
23. Piatnitzky	Levin	Jew
24. Abramovitch	Rein	Jew
25. Solntzev	Bleichman	Jew
26. Zverzditch	Fonstein	Jew
27. Radek	Sobelson	Jew
28. Litvinov, *alias* Finkenstein	Wallack	Jew
29. Lounatcharsky	Lounatcharsky	Russian
30. Kolontai	Kolontai	Russian
31. Peters	Peters	Lett
32. Maklakovsky	Rosenbloom	Jew
33. Lapinsky	Levenson	Jew
34. Vobrov	Natansson	Jew
35. Ortodoks	Akselrode	Jew
36. Garin	Gerfeldt	Jew

Pseudonym.	Real Name.	Race.
37. Glazounov.. ..	Schulze	Jew
38. Lebedieva.. ..	Simson	Jewess
39. Joffe	Joffe	Jew
40. Kamensky.. ..	Hoffman	Jew
41. Naout	Ginzburg	Jew
42. Zagorsky	Krachmalink	Jew
43. Izgoev	Goldman	Jew
44. Vladimirov ..	Feldman	Jew
45. Bounskov	Foundamentzky	Jew
46. Manouilsky ..	Manouilsky	Jew
47. Larin	Lourie	Jew
48. Krassin	Krassin	Russian
49. Tchicherin ..	Tchicherin	Russian
50. Goukovsky ..	Goukovsky	Russian

According to certain authorities Lenin's mother (as likewise the mother of Karenski) was a Jewess. Mr. Krassin's wife is also a Jewess.

Some of these names are so familiar now to English readers that it is unnecessary to give their biographies, but the following brief notes concerning the less known, but still prominent Bolsheviks may be useful:

"Martov (4) was the leader of the Menshevik faction at the famous London Conference of 1893 when the words 'Bolshevik' and 'Menshevik' first came into use. Lenin, representing the Bolsheviks, was his opponent at that time. He is the only prominent Menshevik who has taken an

active part in the Bolshevist *régime*. He has done so despite the fact that he has never ceased to predict ultimate disaster for the present Government.

"KAMENEV (7) is Trotsky's brother-in-law and the chief oratorical support of the Bolshevist cause. He is anything but democratic in manner and in some respects is cultivated. He is or was President of the Moscow Soviet.

"VOLODARSKY (13) is now dead. He was a Jewish tailor from London, who joined the movement soon after it took form and became one of the most hated of the original Commissars. A mob of workmen killed him, but he did much towards launching Bolshevism.

"GANETZKY (16) for a long time acted as liaison officer between the German General Staff and the Bolshevist leaders, making innumerable secret trips between Berlin and Moscow. It was through his efforts that German military aid was brought to the Red Army. Also he arranged the recent payment to Esthonia of 15,000,000 gold roubles, bringing the money to Reval from a bank in Stockholm.

"LOUNATCHARSKY (29) is one of the few idealists in the movement and the man through whose influence the Red Terror was moderated.

"KOLONTAI (30) is the 'heroine' of the Bolshevist movement and her marriage to Dybenko, leader of the sailors in the uprising which put the

Bolsheviks in power, has been termed the 'romance of the Revolution.' It took place shortly after the establishment of the present Government, and she and Dybenko went off on a kind of honeymoon to preach in the Ukraine, not Communism, nor Bolshevism, but Anarchy. This brought her into the bad graces of the Soviet, but later she modified her views, and is now the Soviet Commissar for Public Welfare. She is said to be a most violent personality. Her family was noble.

"AKSELRODE (35) is the man who, after the Revolution, closed down all the newspapers and seized their presses. Since that time only Bolshevist newspapers have been published in Russia. He is now Commissar of the Press.

"GOUKOVSKY (50) was the head of the Bolshevist mission to Esthonia, which was almost exclusively Jewish."

Everybody, friendly or unfriendly, who has come in contact with the Bolsheviks agrees that they are almost entirely Jews. One of the first to meet them in an official capacity was Count Czernin, the Foreign Minister of the Dual Monarchy. "Their leaders," says the Count in a letter written in November, 1917, "are almost all of them Jews with altogether fantastic ideas, and I do not

envy the country that is governed by them." Of the Bolsheviks who took part in the Brest-Litovsk negotiations Trotsky was the one who most impressed the Count. "Trotsky," he says, "is undoubtedly an interesting, clever fellow and a very dangerous adversary. He is quite exceptionally gifted as a speaker, with a swiftness and adroitness in retort which I have rarely seen, and has, moreover, all the insolent boldness of his race." This was in the humiliating days of Brest-Litovsk. What must now be the arrogance of Trotsky, the conqueror of Koltchak, Judenitch, Denikin, and, the organizer of victory, and the prime instrument in bringing England and her Allies nearer and nearer to the peace table!

Here is another piece of evidence one takes at random out of many. In the inquiry into Bolshevist propaganda by the Committee of the Judiciary of the United States, evidence was given by Mr. R. B. Dennis, a teacher in North-western University, who had worked in Russia from November, 1917, to September, 1918, first for the American Y. M. C. A., and since April in the Consular Service. He had been all over Russia, in Rostov, Kharkoff, Moscow, Nijni Novgorod, and Petrograd. He says:

"A thing that interested me very much was to discover a number of men in positions of power, Commissaries in the cities here and there in Russia, who had lived in America . . . in the industrial centres. I met a number of them, and I sat around and listened to attacks upon America that I would not take from any man in this country.

"Senator Wolcott—In the main, of what nationality were they?

"Mr. Dennis—Russian Hebrews."

But perhaps the most impressive piece of evidence concerning the supremacy of the Jew in the Russian Revolution is that furnished in a report drawn up by Mr. Gerard Shelley, an Englishman who was present in Russia in 1918. The Russian Anarchists, he points out, are entirely distinct from the Bolsheviks, and in their individualism, which runs to extraordinary extremes, have much more in common with the Slav temperament than with the highly concentrated system of government associated with Trotsky and his brethren. These Anarchists took a number of buildings, both in Moscow and Petrograd, which they used for teaching and other purposes. Their principal lecturer was the well-known Anarchist, Lev Cherny, and Mr. Shelley attended a series of

lectures delivered by him in the Officers' Economic Society in Moscow in April, 1918. These lectures caused tremendous excitement, particularly the last of them, in which the lecturer dealt with the Bolsheviks. He pointed out that Marxism, on which Bolshevism is founded, really did not express the political side of the Russian character, and that the Bolsheviks were not sincere Socialists or Communists, but Jews, working for the ulterior motives of Judaism. Lev Cherny divided these Jews into three main classes—firstly, financial Jews, who dabbled in muddy international waters; secondly, Zionists, whose aims are, of course, well known; and, thirdly, the Bolsheviks, including the Jewish Bund. The creed of these Bolsheviks, according to the lecturer, is briefly, that the proletariat of all countries are nothing but gelatinous masses, which, if the *Intelligentsia* were destroyed in each country, would leave these masses at the mercy of the Jews.

Now comes the extraordinary sequel. On the very night on which this last lecture was delivered the Bolsheviks attacked with cannon, cavalry, and machine-guns all the Anarchist headquarters both in Moscow and Petrograd, and murdered all

the men they could find, Lev Cherny, however, escaping.

As regards the programme of these Bolshevist Jews, a very interesting document was published by the *Gazette de Hollande* at the end of March, 1919. It contained detailed instructions to Bolshevist agents abroad drawn up at a Council held at the Kremlin in November, 1918, at which Lenin presided, and Trotsky, Radek, and Tchicherin were present. A copy of this document fell into the hands of the Ukrainian General Staff, and the translation we take from M. Miliukov's illuminating book on Bolshevism. In parallel columns we give the Bolshevist proposals for direct action, drawn up in 1918, and the rules of conduct laid down by the "Elders of Zion" in 1897:

Revolutionary Work of the Bolshevist (Communist) Party.	Protocols of the "Learned Elders of Zion."
The work of the Bolshevist organizations in foreign countries is defined as follows.	Our international million-eyed agents, who are possessed of absolutely unlimited means (Protocol 2). We must not stop short before bribery, deceit, and treachery (Protocol 1).
1. In the domain of *international* politics:	The intensification of armaments, the increase of police

(*a*) To support Chauvinist movements and national conflicts.

(*b*) To provoke agitation in order to bring about national conflicts.

(*c*) To make attempts on the representatives of foreign Powers.

By these means internal disturbances and *coups d'état* will be brought about, and there will be increased Social Democratic agitation.

2. In the domain of *internal* politics:

(*a*) To compromise by all possible means the influential men in the country, to make attempts on the men in power, and to provoke agitation against the Government.

(*b*) To provoke general and partial strikes, to damage machinery and boilers, and to spread propagandist literature.

By these means *coups d'état* will be facilitated, and it will be possible to seize the supreme power.

forces are all essential. . . . Throughout all Europe, and by means of relations with Europe in other continents also, we must create ferments, discords, and hostility. . . . We must be in a position to respond to every act of opposition by war with the neighbours of that country which dares to oppose us; but if these neighbours also should venture to stand collectively against us, then we must offer resistance by a universal war (Protocol 7). We have broken the prestige of the *goyim* kings by frequent attempts upon their lives through our agents (Protocol 18).

In order that our scheme may produce this result, we shall arrange elections in favour of such presidents as have in their past some dark undiscovered stain, some "Panama" or other . . . then they will be trustworthy agents for the accomplishment of our plans out of fear of revelations (Protocol 10).

We appear on the scene as alleged saviours of the worker from this oppression when we propose to him to enter the ranks of our fighting forces—Socialists, Anarchists, Communists. . . . By want

and the envy and hatred which it engenders we shall move the mobs, and with their hands we shall wipe out all those who hinder us. When the hour strikes for our sovereign lord of all the world to be crowned, it is these same hands which will sweep away everything that might be a hindrance thereto (Protocol 3).

3. In the *economic* domain:

(*a*) To provoke and support railway strikes, to blow up bridges and railway lines, and do everything to disorganize transport.

(*b*) To impede and prevent the provisioning of the towns with corn, to create financial difficulties and inundate the market with forged banknotes. Special committees should be formed.

In this way an economic upheaval will bring about the inevitable collapse, and the *coup d'état* will receive the sympathy of the masses.

We shall soon begin to establish huge monopolies, reservoirs of colossal riches, upon which even large fortunes of the *goyim* will depend to such an extent that they will go to the bottom together with the credit of the States on the day after the political smash (Protocol 6). We shall replace the money markets by grandiose government credit institutions. . . . These institutions will be in a position to fling upon the market five hundred millions of industrial paper in one day (Protocol 22).

We shall create by all the secret subterranean methods open to us, and with the aid of gold, which is all in our hands, a universal economic crisis whereby we shall throw upon the streets whole mobs of workers simultaneously in all the countries of Europe (Protocol 3).

The complete annihilation of the army will be effected, and the soldiers will adopt the Social Democratic Labour programme.

The supreme lord who will replace all now existing rules dragging on their existence among societies demoralized by us . . . will be obliged to kill off these existing societies though he should drench them with his own blood, that he may resurrect them again in the form of regularly organized troops fighting consciously with every kind of infection that may cover the body of the State with sores.

So much for Russia and the part which Jews have played in the development of Bolshevist doctrine and organization.

CHAPTER X

THE Russian Revolution overshadows, of course, all others of modern times, and in a previous chapter evidence was submitted to show that the Bolsheviks who engineered it are in an overwhelming majority Jews, and that their plan of campaign is to a considerable extent based upon the directions laid down in the Protocols of the "Learned Elders of Zion." It now remains to discuss some other revolutionary movements in our day and to see what features and agents they had in common, and how far they can be traced to the same organization or organizations which brought Lenin and Trotsky to the Kremlin and made Moscow the revolutionary storm centre of the world. Prior to and following the war, there have been revolutions or serious revolutionary outbreaks in Turkey, Portugal, Prussia, Bavaria, and Hungary, and there have been serious conspiracies in many other countries, notably in Holland, Switzerland, and only this year in France and Denmark. In all of

these foreign influences played a notable part, and the question arises whether if these foreign influences had been absent the revolutions would have been successful or necessary. Because a revolution occurs it does not follow that it was either desirable or inevitable. The metaphor of a bacillus attacking a "run-down" body seems to fit. A State becomes weak, corrupt, insecure, and immediately the revolutionary bacilli flock to the enfeebled organism and begin the process of disintegration. In some of these States, notably in Bavaria and Hungary, the revolutions had a short life, and the bacilli were soon expelled. But in others, Turkey and Portugal, they came to stay. As to Portugal, it may be a moot point to some whether their invasion has been to the benefit of the State. But in Turkey there can be no doubt. The revolutionaries who seized Constantinople and deposed Abdul Hamid sold their country in bondage to the German. Enver and Talaat and the others were the willing instruments of Bieberstein and Wangenheim. The Turkish Revolution was the knell of the Turkish Empire. The example of Turkey, in a word, seems to remind us that a revolution may not be a healthful though drastic process but a scourge.

The Turkish Revolution, it can be stated emphatically, was almost entirely the work of a Masonic-Jewish conspiracy. The Young Turks, who consisted chiefly of Jews, Greeks, and Armenians, did not meet in the beginning with much success in their schemes, and it was not until they came in contact with Continental Freemasonry that things began to move. The following quotation from the well-known French Masonic review *Acacia* (October, 1908, No. 70) explains succinctly what was going on:

"A secret Young Turk Committee was founded, and the whole movement was directed from Salonika, as the town which has the greatest percentage of Jewish population in Europe—70,000 Jews out of a total population of 110,000—was specially qualified for this purpose. Besides, there were many Freemason lodges in Salonika in which the revolutionaries could work undisturbed. These lodges were under the protection of European diplomacy, the Sultan was defenceless against them, and he could not any more prevent his own downfall."

Indeed, one can go so far as to say that the Committee of Union and Progress was practically born in the Masonic lodge called "Macedonia

Risorta" established by the Salonika Jew, Emmanuele Carasso. The same review to which we have referred above mentioned in 1907 that though Freemasonry was forbidden in Turkey there were two lodges in Salonika under the Grand Orient of Italy, the one we have mentioned above, and the other the Lodge "Labor et Lux." It is interesting to note that Carasso afterwards formed part of the Commission that deposed Abdul Hamid.

Further information concerning the part that these Masonic lodges played in the Revolution is given in an interview which the Paris *Temps* of August 20, 1908, published with Refik Bey, one of the leading members of the Committee of Union and Progress. The correspondent of the *Temps* asked him about the part played by Freemasonry in the Revolution, and he replied:

"It is true that we found moral support in Freemasonry, especially in Italian Freemasonry. The two Italian lodges, 'Macedonia Risorta' and 'Labor et Lux,' rendered us real service and offered us a refuge. We met there as Masons, for many of us are Freemasons, but in reality we met to organize ourselves. Besides, we chose a great part of our comrades from these lodges, which served our Committee as a sifting-machine by

reason of the care with which they made their inquiries about individuals. At Constantinople, the secret work that went on at Salonika was vaguely suspected, and police agents tried in vain to obtain an entrance. Besides, these lodges applied to the Grand Orient of Italy, which promised in case of need to procure the intervention of the Italian Embassy."

The Committee of Union and Progress retained after the Revolution its Masonic and largely Jewish character. As a striking instance of its influence, we may mention that Ahmed Riza Bey, the President of the Chamber, refused to use the word "Allah" in taking the oath prescribed by the Constitution, on the ground that, like Senhor Machado in Portugal, he was a Positivist. Here, then, is a curious link between revolutionary Portugal and revolutionary Turkey.

Then came the counter-revolution of 1909, and it is interesting to note that the mutinous outbreak of April 13th of that year, which was attributed by the Committee to Abdul Hamid, was really led by troops of the Salonika Committee commanded by a Salonika Jew and Freemason, Colonel Renzi Bey. At any rate, immediately after the crushing of the counter-revolution the

Jewish elements of the Committee of Union and Progress acquired more and more importance. Djavid Bey, the Finance Minister; Talaat Bey, the President of the Committee Party, who was perhaps more responsible than anyone else for handing over Turkey to Germany and thus encompassing her ruin; Djahid Bey, Editor of the *Tanin*, were all Masons, and the first named was a Jew. Political Masonic lodges sprang up like mushrooms all over Constantinople, and on April 1st of that year (1909), representatives of 45 Turkish lodges met in Constantinople and founded the "Grand Orient Ottoman." Mahomed Orphi Pasha was elected Grand Master, and the following "Turks" were elected among the highest officials: David Cohen, Raphaelo Ricci, Nicholas Forte, Marchione, Jacob Souhami, George Sursock. The Jew Djavid Bey, who later became Turkish Minister of Finance was elected Master of one of the Constantinople lodges.

Terrorism and intimidation of every kind followed, and here Constantinople links itself up with Moscow and Budapest. The Ministry of Police was abolished and replaced by a "Public Security Department" on French Republican lines, and put under the direction of Ghalid Bey,

a Freemason. It may be noted that the imitation of the French Revolution in many ways by the Young Turk is another interesting link in the revolutionary chain. For example, a Committee Senator proposed to abolish the word "subject" and replace it by the French "citoyen," while the first "Young Turkey" issue of coins had the motto "Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité" inscribed on them.

And here we may again quote from the first Protocol:

"Far back in ancient times, we were the first to cry among the masses of the people the words 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.' . . . In all corners of the earth the words 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. And all the time these words were cankerworms at work boring into the well-being of the *goyim*, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity, and destroying all the foundations of the *goyim* States. As you will see later, this helped us to our triumph; it gave us the possibility, among other things, of getting into our hands the master card—the destruction of the privileges, or, in other words, of the very existence of the aristocracy of the *goyim*, that

class which was the only defence peoples and countries had against us. On the ruins of the natural and genealogical aristocracy of the *goyim* we have set up the aristocracy of our educated class, headed by the aristocracy of money. The qualifications for this aristocracy we have established in wealth, which is dependent upon us, and in knowledge, for which our learned elders provide the motive force."

Furthermore, the Press was put under the control of the "Directeur de la Presse Anterieur," called Nejib Fazli Bui, while the foreign Press was handed over to another Jew. Djavid Bey, the Minister of Finance, had a Jewish Mason, Messim Russo, as *chef de Cabinet,* and the Committee Party in the Chamber contained ninety Freemasons who voted as directed by Talaat. Within the Cabinet, there gradually was formed an inside Masonic Cabinet composed of Talaat, Djavid, the Sheik-ul-Islam, Moussa, Kiasim, and Mahmud Mukhtar Bey, Minister of Marine. The Protocols speak of an inner or a Jewish Masonry, the true governing power, and an outer or Gentile Masonry, which blindly follows the lead of a direction it does not suspect. The Grand Vizier, Hilmi Pasha, who showed some signs of rebellion,

disappeared and was replaced by Hakki Pasha with a Jewish private secretary, whose brother-in-law, Jacques Menashe, was the go-between of Djavid Bey, the Minister of Finance, in negotiations for the loan with the Bernhard Dreyfus group in Paris, and in other matters of finance and concession. In a word, the Turkish State was held in a Judæo-Masonic group which extended its power to the provinces by the creation of a network of lodges and clubs.

One or two other points in connection with the Turkish Revolution are worth noting. Immediately after the deposition of Abdul Hamid two papers were started in Constantinople, the German-Jewish organ, the *Osmanischer Lloyd*, edited by a German Jew, Dr. Moritz Grunwald, and the *Jeune Turc*, whose proprietor was Sami Hochberg, an Ashkenazin Freemasonic Jew. Both papers were upholders of Turkish Masonry and Zionism, and the *Jeune Turc* certainly aimed at the creation of a Judæo-Turkish State which would subjugate the other populations in the Turkish Empire.

At that period, too, a Jew named Santo Semo, who was at one time on Sir W. Willcocks's Irrigation staff, gave conferences in Constantinople,

Salonika, and other places, and strove to poison the Turkish mind against everything British in Mesopotamia. The "Agence Ottomane," the "Turkish" official agency which was managed by a Bagdad Jew named Salih Guirgi, was busy with the same game.

It is unnecessary to emphasize again how this combination joined itself up with the Germans, but one quotation may be given from the Salonika correspondent of the *Morning Post* in a message from him which was published on May 19, 1911. He said:

"The Army officers and the Turks have long been displeased at the prominence acquired by individuals who are not regarded as true Turks, and whose connections with the Jews of Europe have been considered as facilitating Zionism. The Turks believe Zionism to aim at the establishment of a Jewish State in Asia Minor, and suspect that the Jewish colonies which the Zionists are planting in Syria are destined to be centres of foreign and especially German influence, for the Turks have long noticed the curious fact that the Jews, particularly the Ashkenazim or Russo-Polish-German Jews, are all partisans of the German Empire."

These, indeed, were prophetic words, and readers of the German Press will find any number of

articles cordially approving from a German point of view the creation of such a Zionist State.

There just remains one more development to add. "Constantinople," says one of the protocols, "is the eighth and last stage towards Jerusalem." Now one of the latest issues of the Moscow *Pravda* received in London contains the report of a meeting held recently in the Great Hall of the Moscow Polytechnic Museum, during which Bukharin, speaking on behalf of the Soviet of People's Commissars, declared that the Bolsheviks are aiming at the reconstruction of a great and powerful Socialist Russia, *which cannot exist if she does not hold the Straits of Constantinople.* A member of the audience interrupted the speaker by crying: "That is Miliukov's policy." Bukharin called the interrupter a blackguard who does not wish to realize the interests of proletarian Russia. "If Miliukov would consent to work with us we would gladly give him a place of honour in our ranks," declared Bukharin.

According to the *Daily Express*, Mustafa Kemal Pasha issued from Angora on July 8, 1920, a long proclamation addressed to the "Brothers of Islam and Communist Comrades." He said:

"Communist Comrades, an abominable crime is about to be perpetrated. The Great Powers have decided to exterminate a fresh victim, whose blood will be sucked by the capitalists of Europe. Our peasants are dying, weapon in hand. They can be sure that the days are near at hand when Islam, the ally of Communism, will avenge them."

Later, Mustafa Kemal issued this further proclamation (*Morning Post*, July 20th):

"We have armies ready to march from Persia to Anatolia. After the Bolshevist victory in Poland the Bolsheviks will enter Roumania. The Roumanians will answer the call to arms by a general strike. The Bulgars, too, are ready to unite with the Bolsheviks. The aim of our armies is to guard our independence and deliver the capital from the British."

In 1910 came the turn of Portugal. Here, again, there is overwhelming evidence that the force at the back of the Revolution was Continental Freemasonry. Dr. Friedrich Wichtl, in his book *Weltfreimauerei, Welt Revolution, Welt-republik*, says:

"Some readers may ask us which were then those circles which contributed the most to the downfall of the Portuguese Royal family? They

are the leading families of the Castros, the Costas, Cohens, Peireras, Ferreiras, Teixeras, Fousesas, etc. They have many widespread branches besides Portugal, also in Spain, Holland, England, etc., and in America, where they occupy prominent positions. They are all related to each other, they are all united by the mutual ties of Freemasonry and . . . the Alliance Israélite Universelle."

This close connection between Portuguese Republicanism and Continental Freemasonry was indeed apparent from the outbreak of the Revolution. Senhor Magalhaes Lima, a Masonic Grand Master, was one of the chiefs of the Portuguese Republican Party and its delegate in France. He was in Paris during the outbreak on October 3, 1910, and in a pamphlet which he published at that time, entitled *Republican Portugal*, he said:

"This Revolution will bear fruits, for the proclamation of the Republic in Portugal will not be an isolated case. It will have a world-wide effect, and first of all in Spain."

Another prominent revolutionary was Senhor Luciano de Castro, a reputed Monarchist, who, however, did much to bring discredit to the Mon-

archy. We have already referred to Senhor Bernardino Machado, the President of the Republic and a prominent Freemason.

The violent anti-Christian character of the Republic, particularly in its early days, is too well-known to need recapitulation. What, perhaps, is not so familiar is the close connection of the Germans with the whole movement and the use which was made of it in the German Press immediately on its outbreak for the purpose of discrediting England, the untrustworthy ally of Portugal, which was unable to save its King. Germany then began to lay its grip on the Portuguese colonies, just as she began to seize the Turkish administration immediately after the triumph of the Young Turks. Readers of the Lichnowsky Apologia will recall how the former German Ambassador in London, in a deal which does not reflect much credit on British diplomacy and on loyalty to an ally, was able, early in 1914, to effect with Great Britain a division of the Portuguese colonies conditional on Portugal's acceptance. It was a daring move, too, for a member of the *Entente Cordiale* to propose, for the proposed division would have seriously jeopardized in favour of Germany the French African possessions, and it is now almost

a matter of history that strong representations were made by Paris to Sir Edward Grey (as he then was) on the subject. Fortunately, the proposed deal never came off, because the Wilhelmstrasse, or, rather, the German General Staff, fearing that such a diplomatic agreement might postpone indefinitely the Great Day, vetoed the negotiations. But though Germany refused to accept the agreement, she still kept an eye on the colonies, and through her friends at Lisbon had begun a campaign for their seizure by the favourite device of sending missions, which were actually in Africa when the war broke out.

Thus in both these revolutions we see an alien movement seizing authority and overthrowing the established forms of Government and religion and the predatory German coming in to seize the spoils.

In the revolutions in Prussia, Bavaria, and Hungary, the influence of the alien authority, which in this case is openly that of the Bolsheviks, will be traced.

CHAPTER XI

WITH the advent of the Bolsheviks to power in Russia, a new situation was created in the international conspiracy. In the Turkish and Portuguese outbreaks, which have already been discussed, the Continental Freemasons, working through their secret organizations, were the chosen instruments; with Lenin installed in Moscow, and using Russia as a platform, Bolshevist emissaries pure and simple were the means for disseminating unrest and provoking discord.

We will now deal with their activities in Prussia, Bavaria, and Hungary. It is notorious, of course, that the Germans used Bolshevism as a means towards their own victory (witness Brest-Litovsk), though at the same time they were exceedingly uneasy at the consequences which its progress might have in their own country. But the whole attitude of Germany towards Bolshevism is very enigmatic, and in keeping with German mentality. Just as they were prepared to use the submarine

warfare as a means of defeating the Entente (without considering seriously the consequences which might follow from America's entry into the war), so they are willing to toy with Bolshevism for the purpose of rendering nugatory the Treaty of Versailles (without weighing risk of the revolution which Soviet government might bring about in the Fatherland). At any rate the possibility of a Bolshevised Germany must always be considered by the Allies. When all allowance is made for German duplicity, the present situation is sufficiently serious, for already the Jews of Moscow, working through their emissaries in Germany, have succeeded to some extent in setting Prussia against Bavaria and town against country.

Hungary is interesting because more than any other country it throws a vivid light on the international character of Bolshevism. All the Bolshevist forces (including those in England) are being called on to break down the Magyar rampart, which stands resolute, with something of the spirit of the intolerant but impressive Count Tisza, against the floods that are pouring forth from the East.

Revolution, when it came in Germany, was not a new and isolated event. War circumstances

else, Lenin is an opportunist on behalf of his projected international upheaval.

Already in May of 1918, the Soviet had an accredited agent in Berlin. This was the Bolshevist Jew, Joffe, who was Red Ambassador there until the beginning of November, when he was returned across the frontier. The reason for his expulsion was his notorious activities in league with the Spartacists, as well as with the extremists among the Independent Socialists whose help the Majority Socialists now felt able to do without.

These Independents have not disavowed their traffic with Joffe, and through him with Moscow, in preparing for the Revolution in Germany. Barth, who seems to have been the chief medium for it, denied only that Moscow financed it. Barth has admitted every kind of support and assistance from the Bolsheviks in furthering the Revolution except money. This denial of financial help is not corroborated by Joffe. The expelled Ambassador, on the contrary, boasted of having given Barth "hundreds of thousands of marks." In any case, that large sums were passed from him to the Spartacists is as much beyond doubt as that Joffe had deep resources of money for this particular revolution-fostering campaign. In Lenin's own words

it was "a chain of revolutions" that was being forged, and in that chain "the chief link was the German one." His artisan Joffe, at work in Berlin on the German link during the summer of 1918, is believed to have had four million marks placed at his disposal by the Soviet for the job.

Joffe had scarcely disappeared from Berlin when Radek (Sobelson) arrived there. Jew succeeded Jew. Joffe had been sent as Ambassador to the Government of the Kaiser, and his secret traffic with the Spartacists revealed itself gradually. Radek, on the other hand, entered Germany by stealth, and was Lenin's representative sent explicitly to negotiate with the Spartacists, and with the Jew Liebknecht in particular. For Liebknecht had by now been liberated from prison, and as between him and the revolutionary Government, of which Noske was proving the strong man, the game of "pull Devil, pull baker," had begun. Radek immediately took a hand on Liebknecht's end of the rope. On the last days of 1918, these two were openly advocating a "Revolutionary Communistic Labour Party of the German Spartacus-band." On an early day of 1919, according to good authority, a document signed by both clinched the connection between

the Moscow and the Berlin "comrades," Liebknecht putting his name to it as prospective President of the German Soviet Republic, and Radek as accredited Plenipotentiary of the Russian Soviet Republic.

The terms of this alleged pact, which is believed to have been concluded in the attic of the Jewess, Rosa Luxembourg, in Berlin, are given by M. Paul Miliukov. Lenin on his part undertook

"1. To recognize Liebknecht as President of the German Soviet Republic;

"2. To furnish important funds for Spartacist propaganda;

"3. To place specially trained agents at the disposal of the Spartacists; and

"4. To order Soviet armies to take the offensive and cross the German frontier in support of a simultaneous Spartacist rising in Berlin";

while Liebknecht undertook

"1. To establish a Soviet Government in Germany immediately upon his advent to power;

"2. To observe faithfully and put into practice all the teachings of Lenin's doctrines; and

"3. To raise a Red Army of 500,000 men to be placed under the supreme command of the Commissary for War at Moscow."

Eichhorn—who, it is worth remembering, had been in Joffe's service earlier—was in this league, and a few days later the rising under his direction was scotched by Noske's troops, and Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg were murdered. The hand of Moscow in this attempt was proclaimed abroad by the Majority Socialist Government itself, which threatened reprisals against such Russians as should have been found to have shared in it. Radek was arrested; but Radek by this time had contrived to establish some thirty Bolshevist organizations throughout Germany, and so, with him as well as fifty or a hundred Spartacist leaders off the scene, the attempted new revolution of March 6th to 13th was still possible. It, too, failed, even with the Independents' help, but it brought into the light once more the strength of the union between the German and the Russian Bolsheviks.

All Lenin's eggs were never in one basket, or even in half a dozen baskets. The smashing or cracking of them in one place or in six was regarded by him as merely a local reverse. His objective was world-wide revolution, and he was pursuing it everywhere. Radek's activities had spread far beyond Berlin and Russia, as the March risings on the Rhine and in Hamburg and else-

where proved, and in Bavaria they had important results.

Immediately following the murder of the Prime Minister, Kurt Eisner (himself a Jew, Saloman Kusnowsky by name), and the proclamation of a Soviet Republic in Bavaria by the Munich Women's, Peasants', and Soldiers' Council, a Russian Bolshevik appears prominently. Max Livien, a Jew of Moscow, was on the spot, awaiting events and preparing for them. There was always some emissary of Lenin on the alert at points of outbreak. Livien was at once elected a member of the Executive Committee, and he at once declared a policy in accord with that of the Russian Bolsheviks. There was to be no Diet, but only a proletarian dictatorship. Bavaria was to be allowed to work out its own scheme of government without interference from Prussia. All over Germany, independent Soviet Republics were to be set up. Here, in fact, were all the signs of Lenin's world-revolution policy—the disintegration of the State, a Communist subversion of authority, and the rule of Moscow supreme. The Bavarian plan was only partially successful from the beginning, and in the end it failed, but it dovetailed into the general conspiracy and helped it forward.

It is, in fact, the great strength of Lenin's manœuvres that even when immediately unsuccessful they dovetail into the general cause, working for its ultimate good. Germany did not prove ready to jump to the Soviet idea, but the attempts to force her to it, even while they failed, increased that "attenuation by suffering" through which, in Lenin's own declarations, the peoples throughout the world could be brought to Bolshevist heel.

Thus, although Liebknecht had disappeared, Moscow still dallied with the project, signed with him, of ordering Soviet armies to take the offensive against Germany. That was only one of several offensives contemplated, and in attempting these together the Bolsheviks bit off more than they could chew. But if nothing came of this particular military enterprise, it has to be remembered that the others in the plan—against the Allies in North Russia and Denikin and Koltchak in the South—have now all been accomplished, largely no doubt through Allied mistakes. Lenin has always known how to wait.

And circumstances have always enabled him when pitted against other opportunists to wait longest. Here let us recall that while it was Germany who gave Lenin safe conduct to Russia,

it was ourselves who introduced Trotsky to his side in that unhappy country. Against the single purpose which those errors aided, hand-to-mouth policies had no chance; and the aid lent to world-revolutions by the errors was so timely that the speculation is unavoidable whether they were not deliberately directed to this end. The question may well be asked how it came about that Lenin and Trotsky were allowed to foregather in Russia just in the nick of time for their grandiose design.

The German Governments—both the Imperial before the Revolution and those that came after it—played an opportunist game with Lenin as he with them, but he played it better. We have Trotsky's account of Brest-Litovsk, and how Moscow bided its time while that apparent victory for the ex-Kaiser's policy worked out to its undoing. His Socialist successors have similarly played fast and loose with the Bolsheviks, according as the Spartacist fortunes seemed to allow them to flout Moscow or to favour it. The game is not finished. Lenin's chief pawn in it is the Third International, the creation of which, through the defeat of its predecessors, has been his constant aim throughout the war and since; and it is significant that revo-

lution in Germany is specifically set by the Third International in the forefront of the Revolutions which it was pledged to foster. The Bolshevist hand was detected, by the most competent observers, in the Kapp rising, and this Monarchist failure strengthened the Spartacist cause in Germany. We can trace the same design in still more recent events, such as the Bolshevist order which has gone forth for the expulsion of so influential a rival as Kautsky from the ranks of the German Independent Socialists. This is to be interpreted as a renewal of confidence in Moscow, following on successes against Poland to take a directing hand in German revolutionary politics.

The Revolution in Hungary is particularly instructive. Here the Bolsheviks made clever use of the exasperation aroused in a proud country by peace conditions which placed it in a position of inferiority to its ancient and despised enemies. Bolsheviks make use of any weapon, even the nationalism which is their main obstacle. If a principle or a prejudice has possibilities they use it; when it has served its purpose they throw it aside. This dexterous inconsistency is one of the secrets of their power. The appeal to nationalism

was for the time being successful in Hungary, just as no doubt Lenin hopes he will have a similar result from the appeal he is at present making to the reviving national spirit in Russia, as shown in the talk about recovering Russian territories in Poland and the revival of the claims to Constantinople.

The "National Council" which, it will be remembered, overthrew the Hungarian Government, was composed, according to Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, the special correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, of the leaders of the Radical wing of the Old Independent Party, the Jewish Maffia and the Social Democrats. The ground had been carefully prepared by Jewish-Bolshevist propaganda, and according to an account of it written by an Hungarian lady, Mlle. Charlotte Geocze, who at the time of writing was obviously unaware of the existence of the Protocols, it bears a striking resemblance to the plan of campaign outlined by the "Learned Elders of Zion." In a series of articles edited by the former Hungarian Prime Minister, M. Huszar, the writer of one of them, the editor of the *Nenzeti Ujsag*, emphatically declares in that connection that Bolshevism cannot be explained alone by the revolutionary spirit in

the air and by the economic crisis occasioned by the war, unless at the same time one accepts the fact that its moving force is the tenacious and secret solidarity of the Jews. A further point made is the continuous immigration of Russian Jews into Hungary from the East, which proceeded in a regular rotation; Jews settling down among the Ruthenians as money lenders, ruining the peasants and then returning home. A particular race of Jews, the Khozar, took a prominent part in this movement.

Bela Kun, the leader of the Hungarian Bolsheviks, was a Jew, and nearly all his ministers, like Friedlander, Wertheim, Dorscak, and Kohn, were also Jews. Kun was in close touch with Lenin, and was directly inspired by him in all his acts. Wireless communication was maintained between Moscow and Budapest, and some of the messages thus exchanged made exceedingly interesting reading. In a well-known message of greeting Lenin was informed:

"The Hungarian Proletariat, which yesterday took the entire State power into its hands, has introduced the Dictatorship of the Proletariat into the country, *and greets you as the leader of the International Proletariat.*"

Many of these messages are to be found in the book, *Secret Documents of the Bolshevist Propaganda*, compiled by Professor Szabo, of Hungary, and published in Budapest over a year ago. One message from Tchicherin, the Bolshevist Commissary of Foreign Affairs, to Bela Kun, sent in cypher, with reference to preparing the soil in London, says:

"It would be useful to get into touch with the Russian People's Information Bureau in London. You could best do this by means of Sylvia Pankhurst, whom you can approach through the *Daily Herald*."

In the *Daily Herald* of there recently appeared the following:

"Mrs. Despard, Robert Dell, and Harold Grenfell, as the 'Donors' Committee' of the People's Russian Information Bureau, are asking for £500 to clear off outstanding liabilities and the estimated deficit on the next year's work of the Bureau. The Bureau, as most of our readers know, exists to circulate, collect, and tabulate information on the Russian situation."

Mrs. Despard is well known. Mr. Dell was formerly Paris correspondent of the *Manchester*

Guardian, and was requested by the French Government to leave Paris during the war. Mr. Grenfell was formerly in the Navy and attached to the Embassy in Petrograd. He was the subject of a question addressed to the Prime Minister by Mr. Raper in the House of Commons on July 1st, 1920. Mr. Raper supplemented his question by asking Mr. Bonar Law if he was aware that documents had recently been sent to London by the British Minister in Finland implicating General Sir Hubert Gough, head of the late Inter-Allied Military Mission to Finland, also Commander Grenfell, and Professor Cotter, "as being associated with a notorious Bolshevist agent in Helsingfors." Mr. Bonar Law replied that he had not heard of it, and subsequently, on July 13th, in reply to a further question by Mr. Raper, the Leader of the House said that he had read the letters referred to, but did not think that they called for any action.

The overthrow of Bela Kun was one of the severest blows dealt at Bolshevism, but it is worth while noting that General Smuts was entrusted with one of those amazing Prinkipo missions for the purpose of coming to some understanding with the Bolsheviks before the French and the other

Allies were allowed to advance on and occupy Budapest.

The campaign led by the Bolsheviks against Hungary ever since the return of civilized government has been extraordinarily malevolent and widespread. Bela Kun's Jews, imported from Russia, carried out appalling atrocities during their tenure of power, and on his expulsion there were some sporadic massacres organized by infuriated Hungarian officers, whose womenfolk had been shamefully maltreated. But the Government did, and is doing, all in its power to check any such excesses. Notwithstanding that fact, the pro-Bolshevik papers in Europe, including those in England, were deluged with lurid accounts of atrocities committed by the anti-Bolshevik Hungarians. So persistent were these reports that official inquiries were made by the Allied Missions in Budapest, and their conclusions, which were published in a British White Paper, were to the effect that there were practically no atrocities at all, and that instead of thousands being massacred not more than fifty had been put to death. Yet in spite of this exposure, international labour has decided on a boycott of Hungary, though in the same breath it objects to any anti-Bolshevik

CHAPTER XII

To describe the unofficial activities of the Jews in Paris would be to describe the work of the Conference. Mr. Wilson was surrounded by them; even M. Clemenceau had his watch-dogs; and as for the British delegation, one has only to mention the names of Lord Reading and Mr. Montagu and the close interest they took in the deliberations. Indeed, it will be remembered that there was a strong movement to include the Lord Chief Justice in the original delegation, but, owing to the strong opposition aroused in this country, nothing came of it.

Now the statesmen of Paris, like the Bolsheviks, were guided by general principles. That is the dominant, the peculiar feature of the Peace Conference at Paris. And in that connection let us quote from the *History of the Peace Conference*, the first volume of which has just been issued under the auspices of the Institute of International Affairs. The concluding paragraph of an interest-

ing chapter on the Bolshevist attitude at Brest-Litovsk is as follows:

"Thus by the close of the year it was evident that the demand for evacuation and the right of self-determination meant for the Bolsheviks nothing but the right of 'bolshevising,' and the appeal of their peace formulæ at Brest had long since lost its original force. Yet, in their arguments with the Germans, they had applied self-determination in a bold and far-reaching way, that remained not without influence in many quarters; Ireland and Bosnia, Egypt, India, and Persia appeared along with Posen and Alsace-Lorraine and Armenia. The Russian catchword of 'peace without annexations or indemnities,' which the Bolsheviks had taken over and amplified, had made a deep, if indefinite, impression. The demand for no economic boycotts figured among the war aims of many anti-Bolshevist bodies of opinion, and the precedent of the attempt to realize 'no secret diplomacy' was not forgotten. The effect of these ideas was conflicting, and to a large extent impalpable, and they had become in the main divested of any specifically Bolshevist setting, but, in conjunction with President Wilson's enunciation of principles, they coloured the minds and imaginations of such numbers that they exercised an immediate and profound influence upon the Peace Conference."

It is not by any means the first time that the principles enunciated by President Wilson have been linked up with the new gospel which is being preached at Moscow. Indeed, there is reason to believe that a famous European statesman, smarting under the indifference of the Paris Mount Sinai to the grievances of his country, bluntly told the President that he and Lenin were preaching the same doctrine, and that between the Fourteen Points and the Kremlin manifestoes there was little to choose. And really if judged by their distintegrating force, there is little to choose between the one set of pontifical explosives and the other. A Sinn Feiner or an Egyptian Nationalist can justify murder from either, and "making the world safe for democracy" and "the dictatorship of the proletariat" sound equally sweet in a rebel's ear. Common to both Washington and Moscow is the necessity of an international control of the world; to one it is the League of Nations, to the other it is the Third Internationale. The idea is the same though the instruments are different.

And it is difficult to estimate who shouted the louder cry of self-determination. Trotsky and his Jews were ready to barter away the whole

Russian Empire for the sake of this holy principle. Why? Because like the "Learned Elders of Zion" they saw beyond the ignorant present. At the time of Brest-Litovsk the application of any principle to the Russian Empire, shattered by war and under the menace of Hoffman's whip, really did not matter very much. But what about the British Empire, and its diverse nationalities all in different stages of political development? Such a principle skilfully applied might have all the mysterious effects of an arsenical dose. The need for some such doctrinal poison was all the more necessary because to the surprise and disappointment of the Bolsheviks the war did not end in a draw, but in an overwhelming victory for the Entente Powers. Accordingly the parrot cry of self-determination was used for all it was worth, and to the intense gratification of Moscow was taken up in Washington, and in many a sonorous sentence was commended to French Senators and British working men.

It worked, and is working extraordinarily well, in Ireland, Egypt, India, and, who knows, perhaps soon in Central Africa. The only place where apparently it is not allowed to work is Palestine, where less than twenty per cent. of Jews under Sir

Herbert Samuel are providing themselves with a national home at the expense of eighty per cent. of Arabs. To sacrifice an Empire for a principle is surely a new thing in political idealism. Self-determination has indeed proved the choicest weapon in the Bolshevist armoury. Trotsky could afford to be generous to Finland if it meant in time the gradual break-up of the United Kingdom; he could scatter constitutions among the Baltic States and the Tartars of the Caucasus if the news of this largesse were to awaken the appetites of the politically half-baked communities of the British Empire. All Trotsky's anticipations have been amazingly realized as the British taxpayer ruefully admits when he thinks of the military budgets of Egypt, Ireland, Mesopotamia; war can be fought with ideas as well as with *minenwerfer*.

The British Empire at this moment is in the full throes of the revolutionary trouble bequeathed to it by the Peace Conference with its crude views, its mandates and plebiscites, and all the paraphernalia of democratic quackery. Self-determination is producing its monstrous brood all over the Empire, but it is curious to note how quiescent it is at present in the lands where the Bolshevist writ runs. It is now on the ebb, and the tide is

running in favour of nationalism; witness the recent declaration of Bukharin on behalf of the Soviet of Peoples' Commissions for the reconstruction of a great and powerful Socialist Russia, "which cannot exist if she does not hold the Straits of Constantinople." Here again is another illustration of the way in which the Bolsheviks will use a weapon and then discard it when it has served its purpose.

It is, then, a curious coincidence that, apart from their divergent views on the subject of capital, Washington and Moscow should have so much in common. The trump card of both is the same—international control—and if Lenin abominates the League of Nations, he does so because it is capitalistic, not because it is international. Whence, then, did Mr. Wilson derive his material? It was a subject which greatly interested Paris during the Peace Conference, and much was written about the eminent Jews who surrounded the President. The present scheme for the League of Nations was originated in 1914 at the Conference of the League to Enforce Peace under the leadership of Dr. Eliot and ex-President Taft. The plan then submitted was the basis of the scheme of the League as drafted at the Paris Con-

ference by Lord Robert Cecil, General Smuts, and President Wilson. These names do not give warrant for the theory that the League of Nations as now constituted is the result of the work of Jewish Internationals.

During the war, before America intervened, writes "Pertinax," in the *Echo de Paris* "was founded the American Neutral Conference Committee, which took upon itself the task of bringing about peace with a victorious Germany. Then appeared for the first time all the formulæ of the League of Nations, the anathemas launched against the 'old diplomacy,' which was said to be responsible for bringing about the war. On this point consult the work, *How the Diplomatists Caused the War*, written by Mr. Heubsch, the colleague of the Neutral Conference Committee."

The brilliant French writer, M. Charles Maurras, in his book *Les Trois Aspects du Président Wilson* also deals with this subject—"The decisive influence exercised on Mr. Wilson by a very small company, financiers by profession, domiciled between Hamburg, Frankfort, and New York." "They were," he says, "identified with the Association for the League of Free Nations, with its seat in America. M. Maurras goes on to declare

that Mr. Wilson in time fell completely under their influence, and that there is written evidence to that effect, and he is inclined to the opinion that Freemasonry was used as the channel for the dissemination of these ideas.

Here, then, there opens up a most fruitful field of speculation. But let us carry the argument a little further. The principle of self-determination, as we have seen, not only tends to act as a solvent of existing Empires, but it also handicapped seriously the creation of the new States which were brought into existence by the magicians of Paris. To imagine that a nation could be created by a plebiscite, and that a State could be constituted on the principle of nationality alone, without securing for it adequate economic safeguards and strategic frontiers, was a fallacy entertained at Paris which has had most unfortunate consequences for the peace of Europe. In Turkey, the fallacy reached ludicrous lengths. An independent Armenia was created, and the guarantors of its independence at present are Viscount Bryce and the humanitarians of the world; nobody else will touch it.

Moreover, even if it were safely constituted, other believers in self-determination—Assyro-

Chaldeans, and so on—would raise claims against it. The Hapsburg Monarchy has been divided into States all beautifully constituted on the same wonderful principle, but apparently incapable of standing on their own legs. In plain words, the Peace Conference was unable to reach a political settlement, and because there was no political settlement we now have economic unrest, high prices, demands for increased wages, strikes to enforce them, and general Bolshevism. The protocols say:

"We will create a universal economical crisis by all possible underhand means, and with the help of gold which is all in our hands."

Now, the supreme instance of this attempt to create States on an unsure foundation, and without proper economic and strategic frontiers, is Poland. Let us briefly summarize the case for that country. The policy of France throughout her history had been to seek some ally in the East who would act as a check on any move by the German States across the Rhine. Turkey, Sweden, Russia, all acted as that counterpoise, and with the fall of Russia French statesmen looked to the creation of a strong Poland to serve that historic purpose. A

strong Poland was, therefore, a French interest, and, as Great Britain is the ally of France, presumably a British interest also. Indeed, to judge from a recent quotation by Mr. Lloyd George of a speech of Disraeli, a strong Poland would, in British eyes, act as a check not only on Germany but on Russia.

Now, what happened at Paris? Strategically and economically Poland was compelled to make a bad start. The Polish Commission three times reported in favour of giving Dantzig to Poland, and three times their report was turned down—by Mr. Lloyd George. On the question of Upper Silesia the Commission was also favourable to Poland, and therein it was backed by President Wilson. But one fine day the President veered round, and insisted on a plebiscite. That change of mind was one of the mysteries of the Conference which may some day be revealed. The same story of a vague, unsettled conclusion applies to Eastern Galicia. Thus, in such vital matters as sea communications, coal and oil supply, Poland was severely handicapped from the very beginning. Why? *A strong Poland is not a Jewish interest.* For one thing, how many Englishmen are aware of the enormous Jewish population which lives within the ethno-

graphical boundaries of Poland? In 1910 the total number of Jews in the world was, roughly, 12,506,-238, and in 1900 almost five million Jews lived in Polish territory. It is interesting, too, to note that since the Russian Revolution of 1905, there was a distinct movement in Poland to get rid of the monopoly exercised by the Jews in all commercial and financial activities in Poland by the creation of Polish Co-operative Societies. It is perfectly clear that a strong national Polish Government would further develop that policy, and might lead in time to measures which would by no means prove welcome to the enormous Jewish population concentrated within its territories.

Now, a strong Poland is also not a German interest, and here the Jews and the Germans work hand in hand. Thus, the semi-official *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of January 30, 1919, recognizes openly the solidarity of German and Jewish interests. It goes in for a study of the postulates, which are almost identical to those we have just enumerated, and draws the following conclusions:

"Considering that the majority of the Jewish population knows the German language, and that

German civilization is familiar to them, the Jewish element may be of the greatest use to Germany for the reopening of those international relations which have been interrupted by the war. Germany will not cease to interest herself in Oriental questions. The foundation of a Jewish Palestine must be greeted with approval. This will, for the reasons quoted above, help Germany in ascertaining economic and intellectual links with the East.

"The Jewish question will be of interest to Germany on account of her vicinity in the Near East with countries inhabited by Jewish masses. The autonomy of the Jews in the East is one of the foundation-stones of order and tranquillity in these countries.

"It may be seen (says this newspaper, in conclusion) that there is no contradiction between the desiderata of the Jews and German interests. For this reason Germany will support Jewish demands at the Peace Conference."

It was notorious during the proceedings of the Peace Conference that whenever any decision favourable to Poland was reached, Jewish gentry from London hurriedly crossed the Channel for the purpose of trying to revoke it.

Thus, as we have said, Poland, as created by

the pundits of Paris, started badly. Her subsequent history has been equally unfortunate. The Bolsheviks were exceedingly anxious to secure their grip on a State which with its Christian faith and Western traditions barred their march towards the West. In the letter which Trotsky sent to French Socialists as long ago as October, 1919, and which was given in the *Morning Post*, he made it clear in his bragging way that Poland's turn was to come next. That Bolshevist offensive was launched in March last, and failed for reasons which have been explained by Major-General Maurice, the military critic of the *Daily News*. To say, then, that Marshal Pilsudski attacked Russia, which all the Pacifists and Bolsheviks in England are trumpeting forth every day, is untrue. Marshal Pilsudski tried to do what the Serbians were prevented from doing, that is to say, to anticipate the enemy's offensive. From the very beginning of his attack, a violent anti-Polish campaign was started in England, and the English dockers and railwaymen were called upon to prevent the sending of munitions to Warsaw.

At the present moment, Russia and Germany are joining hands over the threatened body of Poland. If Russia and Germany are able to

overwhelm Poland, the Treaty of Versailles becomes a scrap of paper, and the war has been fought in vain.

Dr. Dillon, in his book on the Paris Peace Conference, says:

"Of all the collectivities whose interests were furthered at the Conference, the Jews had perhaps the most resourceful and certainly the most influential exponents. There were Jews from Palestine, from Poland, Russia, the Ukraine, Roumania, Greece, Britain, Holland, and Belgium; but the largest and most brilliant contingent was sent by the United States."

And with reference to that great achievement of the Jews at Paris, the Minority Treaties, he says:

"It may seem amazing to some readers, but it is none the less a fact that a considerable number of Delegates believed that the real influences behind the Anglo-Saxon peoples were Semitic. They confronted the President's proposal on the subject of religious inequality, and, in particular, the odd motive alleged for it, with the measures for the protection of minorities which he subsequently imposed on the lesser States, and which had for

their keynote to satisfy the Jewish elements in Eastern Europe. And they concluded that the sequence of expedients framed and enforced in this direction were inspired by the Jews assembled in Paris for the purpose of realizing their carefully thought-out programme, which they succeeded in having substantially executed. However right or wrong these Delegates may have been it would be a dangerous mistake to ignore their views, seeing that they have since become one of the permanent elements of the situation. The formula into which this policy was thrown by the members of the Conference, whose countries it affected, and who regarded it as fatal to the peace of Eastern Europe, was this: 'Henceforth the world will be governed by the Anglo-Saxon peoples, who, in turn, are swayed by their Jewish elements.'"

It should be remembered that the original claims of the Jews went much further than those which were eventually sanctioned by the Conference. "The hero of the Minority Treaties," to quote the phrase of the *Jewish Guardian*, the able and moderate organ of Anglo-Jewry, was Mr. Lucien Wolf—the same gentleman who has recently been attacking the protocols. As Mr. Israel Zangwill said, "The Minority Treaties were the touchstone of the League of Nations, that essentially Jewish

aspiration, and the man behind the Minority Treaties was Lucien Wolf."

Let us in conclusion briefly summarize the argument which has been put forward above. Bolshevism and Wilsonism have much in common—including their insistence on international control and on the principle of self-determination. That principle tends to promote rebellion in the British Empire, and at the same time to lead to the creation of artificial States unprovided by adequate economic and strategic safeguards. Poland is an instance of such a State, and Poland has had to face an opposition in which Jews, Bolsheviks, Germans, and pro-Bolsheviks in this country are playing a part. Poland at this moment is menaced with destruction, and if it succumbs the Entente Powers of the West have lost the war.

CHAPTER XIII

PREVIOUS chapters have dealt with plots that have come to full accomplishment either in success or failure. The present is concerned with a conspiracy still in the making, which bids fair to be more vast and fraught with more terrible consequences than any that preceded it. Moreover, it intimately concerns the British Empire, though it is not exclusively directed against it. It is only necessary to talk with any one who is well acquainted with the East to learn beyond all shadow of doubt that there exists throughout the Orient an organized intrigue against European and Christian supremacy. If the person consulted has made a long and careful study of the tortuous politics and secret tendencies of Asia, the information given will become startling by its definite menace and by the proof of the existence of a revolutionary organization that spreads its tentacles from Europe and America over the whole of North Africa and Asia.

Before discussing the danger that must be faced, it may be well to consider how far Great Britain, the Power most seriously threatened, is in a position at home to overcome this serious threat. After the Russian Revolution a section of the Jewish Press displayed an alarming affection for Bolshevist ideas, and openly encouraged Bolshevist propaganda in Great Britain. The *Morning Post* had occasion to draw attention to this dangerous campaign, which was disavowed by the leading patriotic Jews, as is shown by the following letter published in its columns:

"SIR,—We have read with the deepest concern and with sincere regret certain articles which have recently appeared in two closely associated Jewish newspapers in this country on the topic of Bolshevism and its 'ideals.' In our opinion, the publication of these articles can have no other effect than to encourage the adoption of the theoretic principles of Russian Bolsheviks among foreign Jews who have sought and found a refuge in England. We welcome, accordingly, your suggestion that British Jews should 'dissociate themselves from a cause which is doing the Jewish people harm in all parts of the world.' This is profoundly true, and we, on our own behalf and on behalf of numbers of British Jews with whom we have con-

ferred, desire to dissociate ourselves absolutely and unreservedly from the mischievous and misleading doctrine which these articles are calculated to disseminate. We repudiate them as dangerous in themselves and as false to the tenets and teachings of Judaism.

"Partly in order to counteract the mistaken policy of the newspapers referred to, the League of British Jews was founded in November, 1917. The proceedings and views of the League are published in a monthly bulletin, entitled *Jewish Opinion*, which can be obtained at the offices of the League, 708–709, Salisbury House, E.C.2, and which may eventually be merged in a larger journal appearing at more frequent intervals. For we thoroughly concur with your criticism that 'the British Jewish community, most of whom,' as you rightly say, 'are by no means in sympathy with this (Nationalist) crusade, are being served very badly by their newspapers.' Meanwhile we take this opportunity of repudiating in public the particular statements in those newspapers to which you have felt it your duty to call attention.—Yours, etc.,

LIONEL DE ROTHSCHILD.
SWAYTHLING.
PHILIP MAGNUS.
MARCUS SAMUEL.
HARRY S. SAMUEL.
LEONARD L. COHEN.
I. GOLLANCZ.
JOHN MONASH.
C. G. MONTEFIORE.
ISIDORE SPIELMANN.

"April 22, 1919."

Unfortunately the attitude of these patriots was not that of all British Jews, and they were violently attacked for their action. Nor can it be said that the political behaviour of those Jews who have taken a leading part in the Government of Great Britain has been reassuring. It can scarcely be said that Sir Alfred Mond's political achievements merit his inclusion in the Ministry. The connection of Lord Reading, our Lord Chief Justice, with the Marconi affair was, to say the least of it, by no means in accordance with the traditions of our public life. More serious still is the appointment of Sir Herbert Samuel as Governor of Palestine, where a Jew will be called upon to hold the balance between an Arab majority and a Jewish minority in a hot-bed of intrigues. Then Mr. Montagu, despite his family relationships with a firm which has established something resembling a monopoly in the silver market, is Secretary for India.

As for Mr. Montagu's attitude, he disclosed it in a fit of irritation in his opening speech in the Dyer debate in the House of Commons. His speech was not the calm advocacy of his Government's policy which one has the right to expect from a Minister of State whose conscience is untroubled. It was an

elaborate extenuation of Indian sedition by one who has confessed himself proud of the friendship of that leader of rebellion, Mr. Gandhi, and Mr. Montagu's excited denunciation of British "terrorism" in India might take its place beside the striking poster referred to by Mr. Rupert Gwynne: "Conquer the English monkeys with bravery. This is the command of Mahatma Gandhi. Get ready soon for the war, and God will grant victory to India."

The idea of a world conspiracy directed against law and order, and indeed against Christian civilization itself, would before the war have seemed absurd and impossible to the average Englishman. The idea that there could be an intimate connection, say, between a revolution in Portugal, a strike at home, and a murder in India would never have occurred to any ordinary man before August, 1914. The war has produced a complete change of mentality, because we have had concrete proof of close connection between rebellion in Ireland, trouble in Egypt, disaffection in India, revolution in Russia, to mention only a few of the disorders brought about by Germany.

It might have been expected that when the war was finished German propaganda would have

come to an end and everything returned to its previous state of tranquillity. But it is becoming every day more evident that the conspiracy against civilization did not finish with the defeat of Germany. The Germans certainly used various organizations against us, but, as it has been our object to show, they never really controlled or directed them. Behind the scenes was a "formidable sect" using the Germans for their own ends instead of being used by them, and when Germany fell and German money disappeared, the conspiracy still went on unimpeded.

The Germans, when they sent Lenin to Russia, availed themselves of those secret forces of which they had already made use against Great Britain. The directors of the secret conspiracy were quite ready to use the Germans for their own ends of poisoning European democracy. Yet the first result of Lenin's journey to Russia after the collapse of Russia was, as Ludendorff admits, the downfall of Germany.

Those who were with the Allied troops after the Armistice in the sectors of the front where the enemy had been demoralized by Bolshevist propaganda had clear evidence of the terrible power of the forces that the Lords of Germany had so

foolishly let loose. When the French troops first reached the Rhine at Neu-Brisach, a number of motor lorries were surrendered. Each lorry was driven across the river by two chauffeurs, one of whom wore the red rosette that marked him as a member of the Soviet, and the trembling officers watched them as they sung songs of triumph, and did not dare to give an order. A number of officers had been shot down the night before. Many of the lorries were decorated in celebration of defeat, and it was only in the French lines that the officers could insist on these decorations being removed. It was no small local conspiracy that had triumphed so completely over the arrogant Imperialism and iron discipline of the German Army, and the French showed their realization of this fact by sternly upholding the German officers against any sign of insubordination among the troops, who were promptly ordered to remove the red rosette from their caps.

Germany, in her lust for world rule, coquetted with the hidden powers that were conspiring to destroy not only the British Empire and the Allied Nations but the whole of civilization and Christendom. There can be no doubt that the enemy employed the secret organizations which are the

cause of the world unrest, and spent money like water to obtain their support. The "formidable sect" was ready enough to take German money and cause trouble among the Allies, but it jealously guarded the control of its organizations, and when the time came it left Germany to its fate.

Experts are agreed in saying that the cause of the existing unrest in India is mainly an organized form of propaganda which has been at work for years, disturbing, as Mr. Montagu would say, "the placid, pathetic contentment of the masses," and investigation shows that this organization, which is steadily gaining strength, is of amazing complexity. In 1912 attention was officially drawn to the existence of a conspiracy, organized with extraordinary ingenuity in some centre which could not be discovered, throughout India in the proceedings of the Commission on the Indian Army of which Field-Marshal Lord Nicholson was President. India is not the only country affected; on the contrary, the new gospel is preached in every country of the East, whether under European control, semi-independent or independent, throughout North Africa from Morocco to Egypt, in Turkey, Arabia, and the whole of Asia including Japan. Thus it is possible to find agents preaching

the same doctrines slightly adapted for local needs in a "douar" in Morocco, in Teheran, Kabul, Constantinople, or Calcutta. The whole of this vast area is divided up into zones, each with its controlling centre, from which direction is given, and which passes on the word received from other centres.

The character of the propaganda is even more surprising than the perfection of the organization. It is, generally speaking, neither religious nor national, and this very point brings it at once into line with our general inquiry. On the positive side it is what may be called democratic, and on the more definite negative side anti-European and anti-Christian. If the protocols are to be believed the essential part of the universal conspiracy is first the use of the word "Liberty," which "brings society into conflict with all the Powers, even with that of Nature and God," in order to set "all Powers one against the other by encouraging their liberal tendencies towards independence." Elsewhere the protocols state that "the triumph of our theory is its adaptability to the temperament of the nations with which we come in contact." In the East, Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, the watchwords of the French Revolution, have been

replaced by American Republicanism. Republicanism is particularly suited for the East, since "Republican rights are an irony for the pauper." On the other hand, the fundamental notion of the "formidable sect" is the destruction of Christianity and all religion except the Jewish.

There is certainly a great similarity between the propaganda now being carried on in Asia and "the programme of violence and hypocrisy" advocated by the protocols. Religion is regarded by the Asiatic intriguers as a useful weapon, but they do not insist upon it except when a religious question gives them a chance of causing sedition and furthering their ends. They are aiming definitely at setting the Eastern world against the Western, and therefore it is their intention to unite the East and bridge over all religious and national differences. The gospel they are secretly preaching is Pan-Oriental, and their desire is to shake authority in the States under Christian tutelage and to arouse anti-Christian sentiment in independent Eastern States. Asia against Europe is the object at which they are aiming, and no doubt the plotters hope to gain their ends in the world-wide confusion that would accompany a war between West and East.

One of the objects of the secret conspiracy is "with the aid of Europe to promote on other continents sedition, dissension, and mutual hostility." With this object in view the promoters of disorder, who have one of their most important headquarters in Switzerland, have portioned out the areas on which they are to work. Seditious literature and agents pass from Europe to Turkey, and their influence spreads by definite routes over Asia Minor to Persia and Afghanistan. From there they pass to the tribes of the North-west Frontier, and the zones of influence radiate out so that not a village is missed.

Books that secretly hint at rebellion, speeches made in Europe, and cunningly distorted articles from European papers are distributed among those who can read. The agent emphasizes every local grievance and turns a molehill into a mountain, always inculcating the doctrine of hatred of the Christian. Above all, he uses everywhere he goes his personal influence to persuade those he meets that they are hardly treated, condoling with one man on his undeserved poverty, flattering another with tales of the great power that his abilities merit.

There is no scarcity of such agents. They are

produced in thousands, these missionaries of discontent, and their education is not the least of the cares of the secret conspiracy. There are men trained in India, Europe, and America who have drunk in with their study of European knowledge and culture a hatred of Europe. The teachers of Eastern religions and their priests afford a useful recruiting ground for such agents. Naturally they are opposed to Christianity, and are ready to pass on to their pupils the poison of hatred which is all the more formidable that it is secretly organized. There are many European agents, some of them mere faddists, who pass on the dangerous doctrines unconsciously, while others deliberately betray their own blood. From this point of view, Eastern Freemasonry was extremely dangerous when the Eastern lodges sought to emulate the secret societies of the French Revolution, but the vigorous action taken by our authorities during the war, especially in Egypt, has considerably restricted its activity. The "Invisible Force" which is arraying its might against Christendom has never doubted the importance of education. It is laying its hand in the East on the coming generation, for wherever there is a native school within the limits of its propaganda, its gospel is being

preached, and the most certain proof that the whole movement is being directed by a single secret agency is that this teaching is identical from Morocco to the heart of Asia.

Among the agents employed in the East there are few Jews. It must be remembered that the people of the East have an insuperable if tolerant contempt for the Jew. This attitude is not the least of the reasons why it appears supremely impolitic to have Mr. Montagu Secretary for India and Sir Herbert Samuel Governor of Palestine. If the great conspiracy is to be overcome there must be the strictest impartiality on the part of rulers and governors. If revolution has not already broken out it is that there is still a mass of moderate and indifferent opinion which is refractory to this propaganda.

Whether this gigantic plot of throwing East against West is to be attributed to the "formidable sect" is a question that must be left to the individual judgment. All that can be said is that the purpose pursued and the methods employed are practically identical with those which have been considered in these papers. A concrete instance of the working of this conspiracy and a consideration of certain disquieting circumstances that

accompanied it may throw some light on the question.

It may be remembered that on July 1, 1909, Colonel Sir W. Curzon Wyllie, an Indian official respected and admired by both natives and Europeans, was murdered at the Imperial Institute by a native named Dhingra, who paid for the crime with his life. There were certain facts connected with this murder which were never made public. There is reason to believe that shortly before the crime, Dhingra had been in Paris, and it was said that a Nationalist manifesto dated from Paris was found among his papers. It is certain that a week before, the Anarchist section of the Paris police was informed that a group of Indian conspirators in Paris were displaying great activity, and that they were preparing to bring off a *coup* either in France or England, probably the latter. Unfortunately this information was not passed on to the English police, as possibly further investigation might have prevented this dastardly murder.

This Paris group had been working against the Empire for a considerable period, and its existence was well known to the French police, who took all necessary precautions that no outrage should be committed in the territory for which they were

responsible. Many meetings were held in a house in the Rue Laffitte and elsewhere, and a vigorous propaganda carried on. There were some genuine native fanatics among the conspirators, and several members of the Indian colony were terrorized into supporting them with funds and declaring a reluctant sympathy with a movement that filled them with alarm and repulsion. In particular, the plotters sought adherents among the young natives who came to the Paris University to study, and their threats and bloodthirsty language scared some of these students, who were anything but warlike by nature, almost out of their wits.

An important member of the group was a woman of German extraction, who appeared to be the chief controller of its action. There was, however, another woman, a Jewess, who was in friendly relations with the conspirators, though there is no proof that she took any part in their plots. This Jewess was a very remarkable person. Good-looking and ambitious, she flaunted as the confidante of a dignitary of the Third Republic, and it was public report that, with the aid of her own people and the invaluable support of the Grand Orient, she exercised behind the scenes a power equal to that of many a Minister.

In those days French Freemasonry was still a great political power. It was no longer practically supreme in politics, since its position had been badly shaken by the discovery of the part that it had been playing in the Army. The scandal that led to the resignation of General André, the Minister of War, showed that secret reports drawn from Masonic sources were being officially used to the prejudice of officers who were opposed to the form of Freemasonry existing in France. Attendance at church was reported to the authorities and actually served as a bar to promotion. The popular outcry that resulted from these disclosures seriously weakened the political power of the Grand Orient, though in secret, thanks to its organization and hold on the Radical Deputies and Senators, it still possessed immense influence.

It must be remembered that in France the Masonic movement was permeated with Jews. The Hebraic element was strongly represented in the Gentile lodges, and there existed Jewish lodges to which no Gentile members were admitted and in which no language other than Yiddish or German was spoken.

The "formidable sect" has never hesitated in its recognition of the importance of "encouraging the

ideas of others and using them for its own purpose." Further, the protocols admit that their policy includes "a number of private assassinations accomplished by our agents, the blind sheep of our flock, who can easily be induced to commit a crime, so long as such a crime is of a political character." The stupid murder of Sir Curzon Wyllie was, according to the murderer, a political "removal."

CHAPTER XIV

HAVING already given an outline of the vast Asiatic plot which is aimed directly at the whole of Europe as well as the British Empire, we will now draw attention to the conspiracy which, each day growing in violence, is directed at "the Achilles's heel of England," Ireland. The immediate purposes of these intrigues are clear enough, and it is evident that they would fit perfectly into "the programme of violence and hypocrisy" which has been put forward in this book as the secret cause of world unrest.

The crimes which are Ireland's daily history cannot plead the excuse of hot-headed impulse or blind revenge. They are carried out in a spirit of cold, calculating brutality, and as a Roman Catholic priest wrote in a letter to the *Dublin Daily Express*, they are "the diabolical work of an organization." Throughout the world the story is the same—murder, outrage, and disorders contrived and controlled by some invisible power of

evil. In his *Red Peril and Green*, a book which is a mine of information on the Irish question, Mr. Dawson remarks that during the war "nothing was more astonishing or nerve-racking than the cobweb of intrigue, spun by a hidden hand, in which the nation was enmeshed, and in which it felt itself entangled at every crisis." Even more astonishing and nerve-racking is the survival of this cobweb after the defeat of Germany. During the war at least we knew the identity of the spider which spun the web, but now the cause of all the trouble is obscure and mysterious, and the forces of civilization seem to be fighting in the dark.

The stability of the British Empire is the chief obstacle which those who aim at the overthrow of European civilization have to overcome, and Ireland is, according to Karl Marx and the modern Bolsheviks, the Empire's weakest point. Mrs. Webster, in her letter to the *Morning Post* published on July 18, 1920, quoted Karl Marx on Ireland, and his proposal to the International that they should, in order to prepare the way for revolution in England, support the Irish demand for independence.

This Marxian view is still accepted by the Internationalists, and the whole question has recently

been discussed by Dr. Hermann Gorter, author of *The World's Revolution*, and described in the Bolshevist Press as a Professor at the Moscow University. He is connected with the Dutch Communists, and he writes frequently for the Bolshevist papers of this country. Writing in the *Workers' Dreadnought*, Miss Sylvia Pankhurst's paper, on "Ireland: the Achilles's Heel of England," Dr. Gorter states that the demand of small nations for independence can now be supported by Bolsheviks, because Imperialistic Capitalism is shaken, and "this independence now becomes a means to weaken the position of all the big capitalistic nations, and even to cause their downfall."

Developing the application of this idea, which is one of Lenin's, the Bolshevist professor writes:

"For no country is this more true than for Ireland. If Ireland should become independent, Great Britain would be struck to the very foundations. Now, therefore, it is the duty of all British Communists to demand the complete independence of Ireland, and to take all the measures required to bring it about, and for the entire Third International this is of the utmost importance. Again, England is the rock on which Capitalism is firmly rooted, the bulwark of world Capitalism, the hope

of all counter-revolution and all reaction. But Ireland is the Achilles's heel of England. For the revolution on the European continent, therefore for the world revolution, it is a vital question that British Capital should be hit there."

Dr. Gorter states that "the gigantic genius of Marx saw all this long ago," and he quotes the following from Marx, which supplements Mrs. Webster's quotations:

"That country which makes entire nations into its proletarians, which encompasses the whole world in its gigantic arms, that once already has defrayed out of its own funds the cost of a European restoration, in the very heart of which the class-antitheses have developed into the most pronounced and shameless extreme: that England seems to be the rock against which all revolutionary waves are broken, and which starves the new society already in the maternal womb. England dominates the world's market. *A subversion of the national economic relations in any country of the European continent, or in the whole of the European continent, would be* without England no more than a storm in a glass of water. The relations of industry and commerce within every nation are dominated by their intercourse with other nations, and depend on their relation to the world market.

England, however, dominates the world market, and the *bourgeoisie* dominates England."

Dr. Gorter points out that the above "applies in almost a magic way to our own times." England's "gigantic transport fleet" is a menace to the Socialist order, and now that Germany is defeated, England practically dominates the markets of the world. "Now also Great Britain is the rock of Capitalism in Europe." He then quotes Marx on Ireland. Marx wrote:

"Ireland is the stronghold of English landed aristocracy. The exploitation of this country is not only the main source of the national wealth, it forms likewise England's greatest moral strength. It represents, in fact, the domination ot England over Ireland. Ireland, therefore, is the great expedient, by means of which the English aristocracy maintains its domination in England itself. On the other hand, withdraw the English Army and police from Ireland tomorrow and you will straightway have an agrarian revolution in Ireland. The fall of the English aristocracy in Ireland, however, needs must imply and inevitably leads to their overthrow in England. Through this the primal condition for the proletarian revolution in England would be fulfilled."

The remainder of the quotation given by Hermann Gorter from Marx is the one given by Mrs. Webster. Commenting on these statements of Marx, Gorter says that while the conditions in Ireland today have changed since Marx wrote, what he said to the First International "applies still, and a hundred times more, to the Third. The Third International must strive by every possible means to promote the independence of Ireland."

"But in the hands of the British workers lies the fate of Ireland (concludes Dr. Gorter). They must follow the example given by Lenin and the Russian Bolsheviks, who, in order to make the revolution in the whole of Russia, demanded the independences of Finland and Poland and the Baltic States. The attitude of the British workers with regard to Ireland is the barometer for the British revolution." (From the *Workers' Dreadnought*, May 8, 1920.)

Since Trotsky, Lenin, and Hermann Gorter have paid so much attention to the need for breaking up the British Empire, the organs of Bolshevism and Revolution have followed this lead. The *Socialist* (Glasgow), the organ of the Socialist Labour Party, in its leading article on June 17, 1920, discussing the trouble in Ireland, remarks:

"*L'affaire Irlandaise* will yet prove the rock on which the British Empire, the greatest partnership of world-robbery and slaughter in history, will perish. The dissolution of the British Empire, the centre and stronghold of world-capitalism, is the necessary prelude to the success of the world revolution of the working class. We of the Socialist Labour Party of Great Britain are everywhere attempting to the best of our ability and resources to awaken British Labour to action in recognition of its duties and responsibilities to Ireland. . . . The success of the Irish working class is our success."

During the last decade a great and striking change has come over Irish aims and methods. The struggle against the British Empire is being controlled by far more dangerous and subtle brains, and one is forced to the conclusion that the real directing force regards Irish independence not as an end in itself, but as a means towards the accomplishment of world-wide anarchy. In the past Ireland complained of English misgovernment, and at least admitted a solution of the problem which would have left it within the Empire. To-day Ireland will have no part or parcel in the British Empire, and seeks in the pursuit of its independence the destruction of the social order.

The time of sporadic rebellion has passed with the period of Parliamentary agitation. Sinn Fein, once an intellectual movement, has been swept away and finds itself united with organized Irish Labour and the Social Revolutionaries pledged to the cause of Bolshevism and Anarchy throughout the world.

It is a suggestive study to trace the means by which this vital change was brought about. The principal agent was James Connolly, who introduced into the politics of Irish disaffection the philosophy of Social Revolution. From 1903 to 1911, Connolly was in America, and there, as Mr. Dawson points out in the book quoted above, he came under the influence of Léon, who counted Lenin among his disciples. It was Connolly's work that enabled Mr. de Blacam to make the proud boast that Bolshevism was born in Ireland, and Lenin himself admitted that he owed much to the Irish rebel who was executed after the rebellion of 1916. Here we have incontrovertible proof of the unity of control and direction that underlies disorders in every part of the world. Long before Germany had fallen and could no longer provide Ireland with the sinews of war, the Irish movement had come into contact with the High Priest of

Bolshevism and was ready to play its part in the world conspiracy. Connolly was one of the organizers of the Industrial Workers of the World in America, and as such had every reason to become acquainted with many of those who brought about the Russian Revolution. There he must have learnt the doctrines that the "formidable sect" was spreading through the world for its own purposes.

A direct link between the great Asiatic conspiracy and the Irish plot is apparently to be found in the person of Liam Mellowes, who played a leading part in America in bringing about the open alliance between the Sinn Fein organization and Russian Bolshevism. In the rebellion of 1916, this Mellowes commanded a rebel force in County Galway, and after its collapse he escaped from Ireland, probably to Germany. Later, he is to be found in New York working with a German agent. His main object on this occasion was to organize another revolution in Ireland in the spring of 1918, an attempt that failed but another of his enterprises was from our point of view very significant, since it consisted in forwarding money to the Turks and establishing a mysterious Turkish organization in America. It would be interesting

to know whether this organization which thus came into existence after the United States had entered the war has disappeared, or whether it may be anyway responsible for the perpetual flow of subversive propaganda that finds its way into Asia from America.

Of the part played by Sinn Fein during the war there is no need to speak at length. It is a matter of public knowledge that German money was poured into Ireland to encourage rebellion, and the sinister figure of Casement serves as a perpetual reminder of the treachery that was at work. So far as the world conspiracy was concerned, Ireland had long ago shown that it possessed good material on which the promoters of disorder could reckon. What better ally could the "formidable sect" desire than the Ribbonmen of 1850, who wore a ribbon on their sleeves and in their hearts carried the words of the Ribbon Oath:

"In the presence of Almighty God, and this my brother, I do swear that I will suffer my right hand to be cut from my body and laid at the gaol door before I will waylay or betray a brother, and I will persevere and not spare from the cradle to the crutch and the crutch to the cradle; that I will not hear the moans or groans of infancy or old age,

but that I will wade knee-deep in Orangeman's blood and do as King James did.

Such an oath might well find its place in the Protocols of the "Elders of Zion," and Mr. Dawson, when he describes the Ribbon Society as "unrivalled for the purpose of social revolution, unscrupulous, mysterious, pitiless, 'deaf to the moans of infancy or age,'" wrote a phrase that could equally well be applied to the world-wide secret societies with which we have been dealing.

When Germany fell and rebellious Ireland could hope for no more aid from that quarter, it was natural that Sinn Fein should seek alliance with Bolshevist Russia. The negotiations were carried on in America by Mellowes, of whose activities we have already spoken, and Dr. McCartan, Sinn Fein "ambassador" to the United States. The Bolsheviks sent over a Mr. Martens, and an offensive alliance was concluded. Dr. McCartan proclaimed to the world:

"The four million people of the Republic of Ireland, in their struggle to free themselves from military subjugation, want and welcome the aid of the free men of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic. Between the Russians and the

Irish, isolated in their struggle against British armies of occupation to found securely the Republic of Ireland, there can exist only the sense of brotherhood which a common experience, endured for a common purpose, alone can induce."

That the programme of Sinn Fein as at present constituted is practically identical with that of the Moscow International, founded to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat, the abolition of all existing forms of government, and the expropriation of all property, is shown by the following parallel passages quoted by the Duke of Northumberland in a speech made at a meeting of members of the Houses of Lords and Commons on July 7, 1920.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL.

Immediate universal dictatorship of the proletariat, involving the seizure of governmental power to replace it by the apparatus of proletarian power. This implies the setting up of working-class institutions as ruling power, and the principle of all rights to workers and no rights to any but workers, and is to be effected

SINN FEIN, 1918 AND 1919.[1]

The enrolment of all workers in the Union, the Transport Union forming an organized proletariat. The establishment of Dail Eircann, a council of duly elected representatives of the Irish people to constitute *de facto* as well as *de jure* a National Government. The establishment of Republican Courts and the compulsory

[1] From the Reports and Memoranda presented to the International Labour and Socialist Conference at Berne, February, 1919.

by the displacement of all bourgeois judges and establishment of all proletarian courts, the elimination of control by Government officials, and substitution of new organs of management of proletariat.

The disarming of the bourgeoisie and the general arming of the proletariat in order to make revolution secure.

The dictatorship of the proletariat should be the lever of the immediate expropriation of capital and the suppression of the right of private property in the means of production which should be transformed into the property of the whole nation.

The fundamental principle is to subordinate the interest of the movement in each country to the general interests of the international revolution as a whole.

withdrawal of litigants from British Courts. The formation (promised but not yet accomplished) of a board responsible for local government to take the place of the Local Government Board.

With the Irish Volunteers and formation of the Irish Republican Army the latter part of this ordinance may be said to have been carried out in Ireland.

To recover for the Nation complete possession of all the natural physical sources of wealth of the country. To win for workers of Ireland the ownership and control of the whole produce of their labour. To abolish all powers and privileges, social and political, based on property not granted or confirmed by the freely expressed will of the Irish people.

To assist in the efforts of the working class of all Nations in their struggle for emancipation.

This adoption of the Bolshevist programme has meant wealth for Sinn Fein. Seven years ago it was almost bankrupt; today it runs newspapers, keeps up an army, and even equips its assassins with motor-cars. A Helsingfors despatch of April, 1919, gives the key to this sudden accession of riches. "The Council of People's Commissaries

. . . have voted the sum of 500,000,000 roubles monthly for the bureau of foreign propaganda. The first payment of 500,000,000 roubles for the month of February was sent to the Sinn Feiners in Ireland."

Naturally enough, the Bolsheviks in England stretched out a helping hand across the Irish Channel to aid a movement that is admirably organized, well furnished with the sinews of war, and in all respects congenial to them. Mr. Smillie, who was so honourably mentioned in Lenin's despatches, sought to tempt Sinn Fein to the "accursed reactionary chamber" by the bright prospect of finding there an array of Labour members pledged, like them, to the world conspiracy, and suggested: "Your fight is our fight; come over and help us." The cry was promptly taken up by the Bolshevist Press in this country, and the following quotations show how close is the alliance sworn between British Bolsheviks and Irish Sinn Feiners:

"In the fight of the world proletariat for the overthrow of Capitalism, every conscious section realizes that the British Government typifies reaction in its worst form. It is Britain which fights the war against Russia, Britain is behind Horthy in Hungary, Britain is behind the German

Junkers. Generally speaking, the overthrowing of the British Government will be a tremendous impetus to world revolt, and any people or class which is helping to fight British reaction is deserving of support. Ireland, the nearest country to Britain, is in revolt, and in spite of every cruelty and repression, is more than holding her own." (The *Socialist*, organ of the Socialist Labour Party, and affiliated to the Moscow International, July 8, 1920.)

The British Socialist Party (London) published in the *Call* of April 22, 1920, the following manifesto:

"You wish to set up an Irish Republic. So be it. The workers of Britain have no real quarrel with your demand. Only the British ruling caste, drunk with imperialism, and sodden with prosperity, denies your claim—as it denies the similar claims of the peoples of Egypt and India. The B.S.P. condemns the brutal methods employed by the British Government in Ireland . . . and pledges the B.S.P. to assist by all means in its power the endeavours of the Irish people to national self-determination."

The *Worker*, the organ of the Scottish Workers' Committees, also affiliated to the Moscow International, printed on July 17, 1920, an appeal from a Sinn Feiner to Irish people in Britain:

"In the future you must view the industrial centres in Britain as it were from a military point of view and the outposts of our fighting front. Realize the importance of your position and your power to its full significance as a cog in the machinery that produces and distributes the means of existence for Britain. You can help in changing the control of the machinery, or if needs be, *destroy it—Thiggin Thu.* Therefore, your place is in the Workers' Committees."

The *Call*, June 10, 1920, in a leading article on Mr. J. H. Thomas and the Irish railwaymen, says:

"Consider the Irish situation! The vilest and most despicable tyranny of modern times has driven the Irish people into open rebellion. They hold Ireland against their English masters. They are desperately reckless, unscrupulous, if you will, in their fight for the independence which has been their dream for centuries. But they are right. . . . All that Austria, Russia, Spain, the tyrannies of the past stood for, England stands for now. By the sword, and by the sword alone, she holds Ireland. The Irish railwaymen are bound to refuse to carry troops, etc. They would be craven curs if they did less, and it is the duty of every decent Englishman to support them to the utmost limit of his power."

Equally explicit is a leading article in the *Worker* of April 24, 1920:

"Come, fellow workers, stir yourselves. We have to go through it yet, for until we do Ireland cannot be free, nor can we ourselves be free. Not until we have attempted to cleanse the earth of this foul garbage of Capitalist Militarism can we be called men. So long as we make no move to prevent these atrocities, we ourselves are participants in them. Down tools and let Britain rot until Ireland's wrongs are removed."

Tom Quelch, of the B.S.P. Executive, in an open letter to a young comrade printed in the *Call* of April 29, 1920, bids him:

"Think of the men of '48; think of the Communards, think of the Chicago martyrs, think of Marx, of Bebel, of Jaurès, of William Liebknecht, of William Morris, of Jim Connolly, of Debs, of Lenin, of Karl Liebknecht, of Rosa Luxembourg, of Bela Kun—think of all who have given so much for the solidarity and happiness of the human race—and work, and strive, and, if needs be, fight in the service of the World Socialist Republic."

Space will not permit more than a brief outline of the activities of the Bolshevist conspirators in

South Africa, Australia, and Canada. In Johannesburg and Capetown, two Russians preached the world revolution, and as they spoke in Russian to their own compatriots the meaning of their propaganda was not as first realized by the authorities. The result of their efforts was displayed in a strike at Johannesburg, which the leaders proclaimed as the herald of general revolution. M. Miliukov, in his *Bolshevism, An International Danger*, tells how when they were sailing from Mozambique at the request of the authorities, who had discovered their mission, one of them, named Lapinsky, told the revolutionaries who had come to see them off that the Russian Bolsheviks were the advance guard of the world revolution, and that some day he would return in triumph.

Very characteristic of the world conspiracy were the means used for spreading revolutionary ideas in Australia. A secret society organized in small groups was at work preaching the Bolshevist doctrine. It will have been noted that there is an invariable tendency in this conspiracy in every part of the world to use pseudonyms, partly no doubt for security's sake, but also to enhance the mystery that is not without its effect on the imagination of the public and to conceal too obvious

traces of racial origin. Thus, as we have shown, many of the secret leaders of the French Revolution chose their own names, and it is the exception to find a Russian Bolshevik who is not known by a name that is intended not to define, but to hide his family and race. In Australia we find the same system. The members of the secret society concealed their identities under false names, and carried on their propaganda by unsigned typewritten pamphlets. Their activities resulted in a violent demonstration at Brisbane, which eventually ended in the discomfiture of the Bolsheviks at the hands of returned soldiers, and it is reasonable to see their hand in the industrial unrest that followed this affair.

Better known to the public are the results of "the programme of violence and hypocrisy" in Canada, where the movement is very closely connected with the powerful revolutionary organizations of the United States. Toronto could boast three Bolshevist societies, of which the members were ninety per cent. foreign and seventy-five per cent. Russian. The riots at Winnipeg, which were ended by the vigorous action of the North-west Mounted Police, a force that knows how to use force when force is necessary, and by the arming

of loyal citizens, proved that Bolshevist propaganda had made its impression in the West, though the revolutionaries would never have attained the temporary success they enjoyed had it not been that the war veterans were carrying on a demonstration of their own for an entirely different purpose. Among the Canadian Bolshevist leaders there are many Russian and Jewish names, and the gospel preached is the now familiar demand for the overthrow of the "damnable trinity of Religion, Government, and Capitalism." It would be difficult to find a better summary of the doctrines set out in the protocols to be preached to all peoples in order that the "formidable sect" may, when the moment comes, grasp from the midst of world anarchy universal dominion.

CHAPTER XV

THE manifestations of the world conspiracy have not affected really closely the daily life of the average British reader. Revolutions in Russia or Turkey, the failure of the Peace Conference, or even disorder and bloodshed in Ireland, have less immediate result on every day existence than the menace of a German air raid. The subject now to be discussed is of intimate concern to the pocket and ambition of every citizen of the British Isles. Since the Armistice, the clash between Capital and Labour, the increasing demands for more money and less work on the part of the labouring classes, have had a definite and concrete effect on every Englishman's pleasure and business. The main pillar of British supremacy has been our industrial predominance, and it is the object of this chapter to ascertain how far the attacks now being directed against that predominance are due to external influence and to "the programme of violence and hypocrisy" preached under the control of the "formidable sect."

The British working man is naturally "insular" in his outlook, and it is only through foreign influence that the "formidable sect" could bring him into line with the revolutionaries of the Continent. Such influence is mainly concealed, though sometimes the alliance between British Labour leaders and Russian Bolsheviks is flaunted before the world. No more comical example of this alliance could be discovered than the presentation of the Soviet Military Medal to Mr. Robert Williams, Secretary of the Transport Workers' Federation. It was to be expected that the Moscow authorities would be anxious to confer the same medal on Mr. Smillie, who has fought so nobly in the cause of Bolshevism.

Throughout Great Britain, an attempt is being made to create what Lenin would describe as "a revolutionary situation." It has been shown how continuous beneath the surface are the secret influences that control all revolutions. This fact is often ignored by the general public. It regards each outbreak of revolution as a peculiar phenomenon due to conditions of contemporary society, and quite unconnected with similar outbreaks in the past. The demands and methods of our present-day revolutionaries are regarded as quite

modern, and as an evidence of advanced thought, if not exactly an indication of moral and social progress. The Bolsheviks in Russia and the Left Wing of the British Labour movement are not the advocates of new and up-to-date doctrines, the result of the better education, and, in the words of Mr. Frank Hodges, "the awakened consciousness" of the workers, but they are putting before the proletariat a rehash of shibboleths that have been the stock-in-trade of the Internationalists and world-revolutionaries for well over a century.

To understand the revolutionary movement in Great Britain, it is first necessary to explain that the Socialist societies in this country are, with one or two exceptions, International organizations; and that their aims and methods and phraseology are derived from foreign sources—mainly from the Jews of Central and Eastern Europe. We shall never really understand so-called British Socialism if we fail to grasp this important fact. It is the key to much that is otherwise inexplicable. It is, of course, exceedingly difficult for those who are not familiar with the ramifications of International Socialism to perceive this alien influence in movements that are apparently of British origin. This difficulty is increased by the fact that in this

country the *known* leaders of revolutionary organizations are generally of British birth. The International Jew does not usually appear as the leader, as he so frequently does on the Continent and even in the Labour movement of America. The British workman will not, as a rule, knowingly be led by men of an alien race. There are, of course, exceptions, as in the case of the Clyde strike in January, 1919, when the chairman of the Strike Committee was a Polish Jew tailor, and close study shows that the Left Wing of the British Labour and Socialist movement is completely dominated by anti-British sentiments; and the origin of these sentiments is to be found in the foreign influences operating on the Continent and in America.

An essential point in the study of the plans for a revolution in Great Britain and in other parts of the Empire is the connection between the theories and doctrines of the German Jew, Karl Marx, and the methods of our revolutionary Socialists and Syndicalists. The British leaders of Socialism in the latter part of the nineteenth and the beginning of the present century were influenced very little indeed by the writings of Marx. Mr. Robert Blatchford, for instance, has often admitted that

he has never even read Marx's *Capital.* Mr. H. M. Hyndman was the best exponent of Marxism, but he is generally regarded by the modern Marxians as "unsound," because he is a "Social patriot." Until recently, then, Socialism in England was more English in its aims and methods than International or Marxian Socialism. But just before the outbreak of war there was a noticeable drift of the young men in the Labour movement towards Marxian Socialism, with the consequent tendency towards Internationalism and revolution. Since the Armistice this Left Wing movement has grown considerably, and Marxian economic classes have been constantly increasing in numbers. Hundreds of workers now attend these classes, where they are taught the ethics of the "class war" and the need for revolution.

It was the demand of the Marxists for this type of "education" for the wage-earners that caused the split in Ruskin College and led to the formation of the Labour College, now financed by the National Union of Railwaymen and South Wales Miners' Federation, and by the recently formed Postal Workers' Union. This so-called educational movement is one of the most active Bolshevist organizations in this country. The staffs of

the colleges, especially in the North, are almost entirely composed of avowed Bolsheviks and official members of societies affiliated to the Third International at Moscow.

The Labour Colleges and the local economic classes run in connection with these Colleges are mainly concerned with the promulgation of Marxism and the peculiar Internationalism, or anti-patriotism, that is the foundation of the revolutionary movement in Great Britain. Just prior to the outbreak of war negotiations were taking place for the establishment of an "International of Young Proletarian Students." The people most interested in the formation of this International organization were the Germans. The German Social Democrats were to be mainly responsible for the financing of the whole scheme. Here in England, the persons chiefly concerned with the plan were the Marxists, including German and Russian Jews. The scheme should have been launched at the International Congress which was fixed for August, 1914. The war prevented the Congress being held. It is not without significance that the persons in this country who were conducting the negotiations with the Germans became, on the outbreak of war, actively associated with

various pro-German and Defeatist societies, and some of them got into trouble with the authorities in consequence.

This German-inspired scheme for the International education of the proletariat of every country contained the following proposals:

"(1) An International Federation of such Socialist and Labour Colleges as are provided and controlled by working-class organizations *independently* and not in *co-partnership* with those bulwarks of Capitalism—the Church and the Universities.

"(2) An International Working-class Students' Union, in order to secure the rank and file character of this union, the unit to be not the Labour 'Leader" or the Great Committee of such 'Leaders' but the class (controlled by the workers) for the study of the principles of International Socialism.

"(3) A system of International Travelling Scholarships to facilitate an interchange between various countries of lectures on International Socialism, and also to make it possible for working-class students (men and women) to visit and study the conditions in other countries than their own, and to report to their organizations.

"(4) An International Socialist Library, in order to bring within the reach of working-class students translations of the best works on Inter-

national Socialism published in various countries, and in connection with this library an International Journal of Education showing the developments in education in different countries."

The war prevented the realization of this plan, and now that Germany is scarcely in a position to finance the scheme, efforts are being made to link it with the Third International and to make the Soviet Government responsible for its direction and control. The Labour delegates to Russia brought back a letter from Tchicherin on this matter in which he promises to consider how this scheme can be put into operation. The recipient of this letter, Mrs. Bridges Adams, writing to a Bolshevist paper, the *Socialist*, official organ of the Socialist Labour Party, states that some months ago, if peace had been made with Russia, it was proposed to send from Britain this summer a party of students of the many classes now being held for the study of Marxian economics and industrial history—about two hundred, including a contingent from the James Connolly Labour College in Dublin, to Russia, the others to Italy, Germany, and Switzerland.

Mrs. Adams adds that at the present time, in order to meet the cost of this Mission, Mrs. Ethel

Carnie Holdsworth, the ex-mill-girl authoress, is appealing for £2000.

"However, if the money is not forthcoming in Britain, an international appeal will be issued. From Russia, when once the difficulties of which Tchicherin has written me are removed, the response will be generous, even to the extent, if necessary, of sending a ship for the students and defraying the cost of the Mission. Comrades will see the great possibilities of this movement."

Mrs. Adams expresses the hope that this International of Young Proletarian Students will work "within and as an integral part of the Moscow or Third International." She desires support for Tchicherin's policy "to bring together our Socialist Labour students and Russian students; to support him by an earnest propaganda on the movement here outlined in the factories and in the mines, and in the branches of working-class organizations. No mission from Britain would be more welcome in Russia than a proletarian students' mission. The Russian Socialists understand the meaning of International Labour solidarity, and will not visit upon young British workers the hellish crimes of British Imperialism against Soviet Russia. . . . Long live the youth of the Red International."

From the above statement it seems that the Soviet Government, with its overwhelming Jewish influence, is now likely to take the place originally assigned to the German Social Democrats for the control and direction of the "education" of the Labour movement in Great Britain and other countries. In either case, however, the International Jews would be the controlling power, and we know that the instruction provided for the wage-earners at the economic classes and at the Labour Colleges is based on the writings and theories of Jewish authorities in the world of International Socialism.

The "Young Socialists' International" is a movement to capture for Bolshevism the boys and girls of the working class. At an international Conference held at Berlin last December, it was decided to call it the "Young Communist International," and to affiliate to the Moscow International. The British Section is the "Young Socialist League," and its official organ, first issued in May last, is the *Red Flag*. The editor is Nathan B. Whycer. The leaders in London are persons with such British names as Saphire, Zeital, and Troubman. In the first issue of the *Red Flag* there is an article on the Berlin Conference of

young Socialists, written by A. Fineberg. This article is followed by a letter from the "Executive Committee of the Young Communist International," dated Berlin, February, 1920. The letter concludes with the following statement:

"Just as the Russian youth in Russia are defending the Socialist Republic in the front rank of the Red army, just as in Germany the Socialist youth are the standard bearers of revolutionary Socialism, so the proletarian youth in the countries of the Entente will enter the struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeois Governments and the destruction of the Capitalist States, and for the victory of communism through the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Before a revolution can take place in any country, much preparatory work must be done. A revolutionary situation must first be created, and if the natural conditions of society do not tend in this direction, efforts must be made to force them into the right channel for revolution. This is the purpose of the revolutionary Socialists and Syndicalists in this country. Our revolutionaries, working in conjunction with foreign revolutionaries, who are mainly International Jews, have to find ways and means of creating in Great Britain

an industrial crisis of such a magnitude that a revolution will be practically inevitable. This is the immediate problem of the revolutionary movement here. How will this crisis be brought about?

A very significant quotation has already been given:

"Want and opinion are the two agents which make all men act. Cause the want, govern the opinions, and you will overturn all the existing systems, however well consolidated these may appear."

This is sound revolutionary doctrine. Now, the whole case for Marxism rests on the entire break-up of the existing social order. Marx himself believed that this would be brought about by hunger and want driving the masses into a violent revolution. The theory was that the development of the capitalist system would be in the direction of an ever-widening gulf between the rich and the poor. He wrote that "the rich are getting richer, the poor poorer, the middle class is being crushed out," and he predicted that the condition of the workers would become worse until they were driven by sheer desperation to revolution. "Then the knell of the capitalistic system will have

sounded. The producers will assert themselves under the pressure of an irresistible impulse; they will repossess themselves of the implements of production of which they have been so long deprived."

These predictions of Marx have been falsified by events. The extreme poverty and sufferings of the workers, on which his anticipations were based, have not been experienced, least of all in this country. The British worker has, on the whole, greatly improved his economic position since Marx made his predictions. And this comparative prosperity of the British worker is the greatest obstacle, not only to a revolution in this country, but to the world revolution planned by the foreign revolutionaries. It is admitted by Trotsky and by Dr. Hermann Gorter, author of *The World Revolution*, that their plans for a world-wide revolution cannot be successful so long as there is a united British Empire. This was also the opinion of Karl Marx.

The problem of the international organizers of revolution consists of (1) how to destroy Britain's industrial prosperity, and (2) how to break up the British Empire. The first of these objects is to be realized by strikes, the reduction of output, and by

constant demands for higher wages until the profits of each industry are absorbed by Labour. The second object is to be attained by supporting and organizing rebellions and insurrections in various parts of the Empire. The cumulative effect of this policy, if successful, would certainly be extreme poverty and suffering for the masses, and a "revolutionary situation" would undoubtedly exist. If at the same time opinion were properly controlled it would be possible to overthrow the existing social order, and to set up a Dictatorship of the kind advocated by the International Socialists. In the International publications of the Bolsheviks, which are widely circulated in this country, will be found proposals for the destruction of our industries, the break-up of the Empire, and for the control of opinion by a Minority acting as a Dictatorship. In this effort to bring about a revolution all sorts of methods are proposed. A writer in the *Worker*, the organ of the Scottish Workers' Committees, states:

"It must not be supposed that, though we pin great faith in improved industrial organization, we are industrial absolutists, relying on industrial action alone to bring about the workers' emancipation. As Karl Radek so finely puts it: 'Victory

has got to be earned by a daily combat with the *bourgeoisie* on all the domains of social life, a combat developing finally into direct revolutionary strife, class against class.' The industrial weapon will have to be supplemented by other weapons evolved by the workers as the struggle increases in intensity. The strike, supplemented by the other weapons, will have to be used against the State, as well as against the employers, until the Capitalist State has been brought to the ground and the workers, under the shield of the proletarian dictatorship, are building up the new Communist Republic." (The *Worker*, June 12, 1920.)

What the Jew, Karl Radek, means is indicated in an article he has recently written for the *Call*, the organ of the British Socialist Party—a party of which the members in London are mainly foreign Jews, as any one can see who attends a London meeting of the party. In this article, Radek states that if Great Britain does not come to terms with the Soviet Government, the British Empire will be attacked by the Bolsheviks at its most vulnerable point—India. The quotation the *Worker* gives from Radek recalls the boast of the "Elders of Zion" that they have instilled class hatred into the peoples.

The revolutionaries in Great Britain, acting on

instructions from the International at Moscow, profess to believe that the capitalist system cannot recover from the economic effects of the war, and they quote in support of this conclusion a book, *Capitalism Today*, by Ernst Kahn, an American Marxist. This book is very popular with the Marxian economic classes, and a cheap edition is shortly to be published by Charles Kerr, publisher for the American Socialists. Under the economic crisis that is developing, the workers will be driven "to rebel against the whole *régime*, and will substitute their own power. It is here that the function of the Communist arises. The workers, as a whole, rebel against a *régime* of which they feel the pricks, without any preconceived doctrinaire theory. It is the business of the Communist to guide their movements into its realization in the dictatorship of the proletariat."

This advice is, we find, generally acted upon in Labour disputes in this country. For instance, in an article on the gas strike at Manchester, in the *Workers' Dreadnought*, July 17th, 1920, it is stated that "Communists ought to be on the spot wherever such spontaneous revolts occur, doing vital propaganda, endeavouring to communistically educate discontent."

The writer goes on to express satisfaction with this strike, and states that this working-class power "if used in the general strike would bring, not merely a wage increase for a few, or all, but create in the industrial world right and ripe conditions for full proletarian control."

CHAPTER XVI

IN every part of the country we find that the International Revolutionaries desire to control and direct Labour unrest and discontent. They have a general contempt for the intelligence of the masses, and assume that they will never go in the right direction without their guidance. This contempt for public opinion is fully expressed by Mr. G. D. H. Cole in his book, *The World of Labour*, p. 34.

"For if there can be greater dishonesty in envisaging the problem, a greater refusal to face the facts, than that which the aspiring politician has to learn, it is assuredly to be found in the narrowness, egoism, and intellectual indolence that characterize the great British public. If the industrial revolution has turned the worker into a mere producing machine, it has quite equally turned the public into a mass of mere consumers, with consciences always in their pockets and brains nowhere or directed to anything rather than the social question. In this country, at least, it is useless to

invoke public opinion, because it is selfish, unenlightened, and vindictive."

How this direction of the workers towards revolution is to be secured is explained in the *Call* of May 20, 1920, in an article on "Communist Organization." The *Call* is the official organ of the British Socialist Party (London), and Tchicherin, Litvinov, Fineberg, and other members of the Soviet Government were active members of the B.S.P. when living in London. Karl Radek, Clara Zetkin (German Spartacists), N. Osinsky, and many other Jewish revolutionaries of the Continent are frequent contributors to it. The party is affiliated to the Third International, and the letter from Lenin to the British Workers, brought by Messrs. Shaw and Turner, was directed to the B.S.P., and contained a covering letter on behalf of Lenin, signed by Marcel Rosenberg.

The article referred to outlines the methods to be adopted by the revolutionaries to prepare the Labour movement for the coming revolution. The writer describes the working-class organizations as in the main "like rudderless craft in conflicting currents. The mission of the Communist is to supply the rudder."

"During the stormy period of transition from Capitalism to Socialism, we shall require new machinery of government and production. May it not be that we can use the Trade Unions as our machinery of production, and the Co-operative movement as the framework of our machinery of distribution?

"We need a revolutionary Communist group in every Trade Union branch, in every local Labour Party, on every committee of management of a Co-operative Society; responsible directly to the branch of the Party in that locality, guiding the mass of the workers into the Communist path, preparing for the day when the existing machinery of society is no longer adequate to carry out the desires of the people.

"By these means the existing working-class organizations can be made to serve the purpose of the revolutionary proletariat. Each branch of the Party should co-ordinate the activities of these organizations in its area and render periodical reports to Party headquarters. Headquarters would thus become the real nerve-centre of Communist propaganda. By this means, in a short time it would be possible to ensure the election of Communists to all executive and organizing posts in the Trade Unions and the Labour Party.

"At the same time, recruiting should be proceeded with from the point of view of attracting to our Party the flower of the proletariat. If a

young man of promise is elected as branch secretary or shop-steward in a Trade Union, he should become the objective of intensive personal propaganda to convert him to our ideals. By thus supplying the bulk of the acknowledged leaders of the working class, it would follow that the lead of the Communist Party would be instinctively followed in a time of crisis. Wherever workers meet to discuss wages or the conditions of existence, there should be found a group of comrades ready to help them in their immediate aims, and at the same time point to the root cause of all their grievances and suffering in order to make them realize that only with the overthrow of Capitalism can their conditions be permanently bettered. . . .

"It is at least certain, however, that only by becoming the leaders and guiding force of such organizations as exist today can the Communist and the revolutionary tomorrow hope to carry with them the mass of the proletariat.

"Close up the ranks, comrades!"

In the same issue is an article by Otto Maschl, reproduced from *Le Bulletin Communiste*, on the function of Workers' Councils, in which he describes them as "revolutionary *ante-chambers*." "They are the touchstones, which constantly excite the hatred of the bourgeoisie, even if they

are not at all inspired with revolutionary sentiments. For they are the most suitable instruments for keeping alive the class war."

The aims of these organizers of revolution are revealed in an article by Clara Zetkin, specially written for the *Call* of April 29, 1920. This writer is a Jewess, and has taken the place of Rosa Luxembourg as a leader of the German Communists. In this article she describes the progress the International Revolutionaries are now making.

"Over Italy roar the thunders of the coming storm; in France there is sheet-lightning; storms rage through the proud Empire of Great Britain. In England and Scotland growing masses of workers unite round the Socialist, the Communist, flag. Ireland, Egypt, and India are in revolt. The wage slaves in the United States muster for the class struggle; their strikes become greater and greater in extent, more important, and take a revolutionary character. The international situation, in consequence of the diplomatic squabbling among the Allied Powers for the booty of the world war, is rich in conflicts, pregnant with future wars. Here, too, the economic basis of Capitalist order, class antagonism, and class struggles, grow in intensity and bitterness. From beneath the volcanic depths of Society rises Socialism, Communism."

She goes on to call not for resolutions but for mass action.

"Now the battle between workers and bourgeois is no longer one for reforms in the Capitalist order, its aim is to overthrow, to subdue this order. Capitalism or Socialism and Communism is the battle-cry. No resolutions on paper must be the aim, but the living, powerful action of the working masses."

She concludes by appealing to the British workers to rally "to the red banner of the Third International," and sends them greetings from the Communists of "Germany in revolution."

In the *Socialist*, the organ of the Socialist Labour Party (Glasgow), which is affiliated to the Third International and provides nearly all the strike leaders on the Clyde, there appeared on April 22, 1920, a statement from the Communist Bureau at Amsterdam urging the workers in Great Britain to strike on May Day. The appeal is signed by H. Roland Holst. In the course of this statement it is declared that "a real peace" with the Soviet Republic of Russia "is impossible under Capitalism." "A real peace for Russia means the victory of the World Revolution, and nothing less." He advises other countries to strive towards Soviet Republics.

"This inspiring aim we must always have in mind in all our deeds, in all our actions. We must fill our heads with revolutionary thoughts, we must be willing to destroy the weapons of our enemies. . . . All this we can only achieve in a constant fight with our exploiters, by giving this fight a general revolutionary character. It means a complete break with bourgeois civilization, bourgeois morals, bourgeois supremacy. It means Labour as the basic principle of social and moral life. . . . The outward façade of the bourgeois state of society still exists, but it may fall to pieces at any moment, although a long and severe struggle will doubtless be necessary, as much to finally crush the bourgeoisie as to affect in the mass of the people the moral and intellectual transformation that will make them able to institute the Communist Commonwealth, and render them fit to live in it. We may be convinced that any little thing, an indifferent circumstance, may now at any moment, by causing the countless elements of the new revolutionary consciousness floating all over the world to unite into a new body and manifest themselves with unexpected force, be the instigator of renewed strife and promiseful upheaval. . . . The times for the passing of Capitalism are ripe, and any dead calm may be the foreboder of new social storms unexpectedly rising."

"Prompted by these considerations," the Am-

sterdam Bureau urges the workers' organizations to be prepared for action and to strike on May Day 1920, "in favour of Soviet Russia."

The Executive of the Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of the Third International is one of the chief foreign influences that affect our revolutionary societies. The manifestoes of this Bureau are signed by D. J. Wynkoop, Henrietta Roland Holst, and G. J. Rutgers. In the B.S.P. organ, the *Call* of April 1, 1920, there is a long manifesto from this Bureau entitled "German Revolution: An Appeal to the British, French, and Belgian Proletariat." After condemning the Allies for their treatment of Germany, it bursts into exhortations.

"Workers of the Entente! Loudly proclaim your solidarity with the German revolution! Compel your Governments to withdraw the troops from the occupied territory. Railwaymen! Refuse to allow the transport of any troops or any arms or munitions to Germany. All of you answer any attempt on the part of your Governments to strangle the German revolution by extending and intensifying your own revolutionary activity."

The writers of this manifesto compliment the British Proletariat on the magnificent meetings

of the "Hands off Russia" Committee, and they state that the revolutions in various countries are part of one revolution, the Social Revolution. The "fate of the European Revolution depends on you," they write, and conclude with "Hurrah for the Communist Revolution in Germany! Hurrah for the World Revolution, the Universal Soviet Republic!"

In an article by Dr. Hermann Gorter written for *Data* (February, 1920), the "organ of the Socialist Information and Research Bureau" (Scotland), he specially appeals to the British workers to lead the European Revolution—the English proletariat "must place itself at the head of the proletariat in Western Europe." "The fate of the world revolution, the fate of humanity, lies in the hands of the English workers."

Among the supporters of this Bolshevist campaign against the British Empire is Mr. E. D. Morel, of the notorious Union of Democratic Control. Writing in *Foreign Affairs*, the organ of the U.D.C., for June, 1920, Mr. Morel discusses "The Why and the Wherefore of the War against Russia." The British attack on the Bolsheviks is, according to Mr. Morel, inspired by fear of the result of a strong Socialist State in Russia.

"The advent of a great Socialist State in Europe is a solvent of Empire. Empire—the dominion over many nationally conscious peoples by a single alien people—and Socialism are irreconcilable factors. They are mutually destructive. The Imperialists who presently govern the British Empire and who contemplate the consequences of the triumphant emergence of a great Socialist State in the geographical position of Russia—half European, half Asiatic—are not thinking in terms of Britain when they seek to prevent such a consummation. They are thinking in terms of the British Empire."

After stating that British capital has nothing "to fear from the growth to adolescence of a Russian Socialist State," because Lenin is willing to give us trading concessions if we will make peace with him, he says: "But British Imperialism has everything to fear from the survival of Soviet Russia."

"The heart of the British Empire beats in Asia—I speak, not of the Commonwealth, but of the Empire. . . . The Russian mind knows how to read the Asiatic mind. Picture Russia a Socialist State, freed from her external foes, flanked by a series of racially alien or politically allied—sometimes both—lesser States, not in Europe only but

in Asia, States enjoying full autonomy, permeated with Socialist ideals and precepts and practices radiating from a centre where education and science have been elevated into fine arts, where the treasures of knowledge, the accumulated learning of the ages are thrown open to all, made accessible to the humblest citizen. Picture Russia thus—then look at India, Persia, Afghanistan, Burma, under present conditions. Need you ask why British Imperialism shrinks at the prospect and fears; fears unutterably as it scans the future?"

Mr. Morel goes on to declare that British Imperialism is today more unyielding and intolerant in consequence of the "very magnitude of its successes in the war," which have intoxicated it. "It has become a militarist Imperialism as it never was before." Lenin and Trotsky have discredited Western diplomacy, and "the dangers to be apprehended from the future are so enormous for the existing Order that the Russian wreckers of the occult power which rules the people's lives must be broken." Morel therefore concludes that British Imperialism is fighting the Bolsheviks because it "knows its very existence is at stake."

These statements from Morel resemble those of

Trotsky and Radek on attacking the British Empire in Asia.

The "Elders of Zion" used "anarchy as a means to an end." This view is supported by the manifesto of the Executive Committee of the Third International, published in the *Call* of April 22, 1920, and signed by G. Zinoviev. This manifesto states that the revolutionary forces in France, America, England, and Germany are growing, and "Anarcho-Socialist bodies and those individuals who till now claimed to be orthodox anarchists, mix themselves up with the others in the general current. The Executive Committee of the Third International welcomes this most cordially." After explaining how Syndicalists and Anarchists, being opposed to Parliaments, may help on the world revolution, the Committee declare that "the bourgeois State, its Kings, Presidents, Parliaments, Constituent Assemblies, etc., are our deadly enemies and must be crushed." They point out that it is possible at times to further the revolution in a country by participating in political action, and they instance Liebknecht in Germany and Hoglund in Sweden. The latter, "utilizing Parliament, precipitated the collapse of Parliamentism. Nobody has ever done more than he in Sweden for the

Revolution." The same again in Bulgaria, where the "Communists also used the pulpit of Parliament for the propagation of the ideas of the Communist Revolution." These revolutionaries are to enter Parliament with the intention of getting "into closest touch with its machinery, and then put spokes in its wheels."

Conditions in England, France, and America are not yet ripe for the overthrow of the State. In these countries "there have been very few individuals who could be said to resemble the Russian Bolsheviks or the German Spartacists." So the Committee at Moscow advise that:

"If such elements (Bolsheviks and Spartacists) increase in numbers and strength, everything may get changed. At first it is necessary: (1) The centre of gravity of the struggle must be outside of Parliaments (strikes, revolts, insurrections, etc.); (2) the struggle inside the Parliaments must be closely connected with the struggle outside; (3) the representatives must take part in general organization work; (4) the representatives must act by directions of the Central Committee and be responsible to it; (5) they must not conform to the Parliamentary manners and customs."

The manifesto concludes with the following interesting instructions:

"We have to state again that the most vital part of the struggle must be outside of Parliament —on the street. It is clear that the most effective weapons of the workers against Capitalism are: The strike, the revolt, armed insurrection. Comrades have to keep in mind the following: Organization of the Party, instalment of the Party groups in the Trade Unions, leadership of the masses, etc. Parliamentary activities and participation in elections must be used only as a secondary measure—no more."

(*Call*, April 22, 1920.)

This manifesto also appeared in the *Socialist* (Glasgow) and other Bolshevist papers in this country. The National Council of Shop Stewards' and Workers' Committees, a body affiliated to the Moscow International, is carrying out these Moscow Instructions on the industrial side.

Confirmation of the anti-Christian nature of the Jewish secret organizations described earlier in this book is found in an article in the *Call* of April 1, 1920. An article entitled "Man has Arisen!" by John Bryan, describing the new "light in the East"—Bolshevism—says:

"The pagan world could not have been worse than this world of Christianity. Only it had no bishops to preach from the pulpits the Easter lie, and to administer 'opium' to the masses, as the Bolshevik inscription on one of Moscow's church gates boldly puts it."

But "a new light has arisen in the East, and not a will o' the wisp, a light that reveals the truth, and shows the road, that inspires hope and confidence, that warms and encourages, that adds to the strength of the body and the soul . . . Russia led by the Bolsheviks, Russia guided by the transcendent genius of Lenin, and assisted by a host of workers with Trotsky, the incomparable organizer, at their head—this Russia has been the saviour of the world, its redeemer from cynicism, scepticism, and demoralization which had been gnawing at its very vitals, threatening destruction and death." For this part Russia has been "crucified by the capitalist Powers," and she is bleeding from every pore. "But, unlike Christ, she did not weep bloody tears out of pity for herself when making up her mind rather to be crucified than to betray the trust which history had placed in her hands; nor is she likely to die on the cross before she accomplishes her mission . . . she lives, and

gives life, and, soon, she will descend from the cross and cry out to the world: 'Man has risen!'"

In the study of the revolutionary movement in this country, it is important to note how it is guided by the writings of foreign revolutionaries, mainly Jews. The following are only a few of the more prominent and frequent foreign contributors to the Bolshevist Press in Great Britain, whose books and articles are largely circulated in this country in connection with the Marxian economic classes, and for the purpose of revolutionary propaganda. The works of Marx and Engels are, of course, textbooks in all classes run by the Labour College Movement and by the Bolshevist Societies.

The articles of Lenin and Trotsky are published regularly in the *Call*, the *Socialist*, the *Workers' Dreadnought*, the *Worker*, and other Bolshevist papers. Bela Kun is also another frequent contributor to British Bolshevism, and he writes to the current issue of the *Workers' Dreadnought* suggesting that the "Hands off Russia" Committee "should be used for Bolshevist ends in the home movement." Dr. Hermann Gorter also writes regularly for papers in London and Glasgow, and his book, *The World Revolution*, published

by the Socialist Information and Research Bureau (Glasgow), is on sale at most revolutionary meetings in London and the provinces. The following may be mentioned as International Revolutionary leaders who contribute to the movement in this country:

N. Hoglund, of Sweden; Lucien Deslinières, of France; N. Bucharin, of Moscow, author of the *Programme of the World Revolution;* Clara Zetkin, Jewess and leader of the German Communist Party; M. I. Kalinin, chairman of All-Russian Central Executive of Committee of Soviets; Karl Radek, of Moscow; Sadoul, Souvarine, Shumiatzki, I. Marchlevski (Karski), Alexandre Kolontay, Russian Soviet Commissary for Social Welfare.

We have now concluded our inquiry into the cause of world unrest, and it is for our readers to judge how far it provides an explanation of the revolutionary movements which are disturbing alike the faith of Christian men and women and the whole system of government on which Western civilization has been built up. The famous protocols may or may not be genuine, but even the most sceptical must admit that they are the abstract of a philosophy which may be devilish, but which is certainly coherent, and that in many important

points they not only anticipate, but explain, some of the ills from which the world is at present suffering. It is the element of time which is inclined to prejudice the Western, particularly the English, reader against them. Can it be possible that any body of men can seriously commit themselves to a plot which is to be worked out not in years but in centuries, and the fruits of which they themselves can never gather? But it must be remembered that the whole idea is Eastern, and in the East they still think in centuries. A child with difficulty can span the period of a week, the ordinary Englishman that of a decade. But an Englishman who has lived long in the East has quite a different conception of time, and would not find the long roll of years between the prophecy and its fruition a ban to belief. Therefore, let the scoffers remember that all periods of time are relative, and that to some a thousand years may be as a day.

In the first part of this book, the doctrines and programme of revolutionary Freemasonry were described and the *liaison* between them and the protocols examined. In later chapters, modern revolutionary phenomena were considered in the light of the plot revealed earlier. Can we trace a connection between the two? Our readers must

decide for themselves on the evidence submitted to them. It has been shown that the Continental Freemasons were primarily responsible for the revolutions in Turkey and Portugal, and that in the former at least, the Jews had a prominent share in this Masonic conspiracy. When the Bolsheviks seized power in Moscow—and we gave a table showing that the vast majority of them were Jews—the propaganda of Litvinov, Radek, and company took the place to a considerable extent of the subterranean Masonic activities and the threads of the plot were therefore easier to trace. For example, we showed how this Bolshevist-Jewish gang tried to take control of the Governments of Prussia, Bavaria, and Hungary.

We also drew attention to the secret influences working in Paris during the Peace Conference, to the curious fact that the principle of self-determination, so dangerous at present to the authority of the British Empire, was common to both Wilsonism and Leninism, and that Poland, which both Jews and Germans fear, was left economically and strategically weak by the Conference and, along with Hungary, has been malevolently attacked by the forces of International Labour working under Bolshevist direction. Finally, we

sought to trace a link between the conspiracy and some of the agitations which are at present gravely threatening the security of the British Empire.

Throughout this book we have referred to the menace which this conspiracy constitutes not only to civilized government but to the Christian faith. It is indeed clear that never in its history has that faith had to undergo so organized and sustained an attack. Men's thoughts are continually being concentrated on things material, on the inequalities of wealth, on mean and trivial pleasures, and are being told that the cure for all their ills lies not in themselves but in a peculiar form of government. The Bolsheviks know perfectly well that their cause can make no lasting progress unless it first gets rid of Christianity with its superb indifference to the things on which the world sets such store. Therefore it may be taken as certain that these attacks will be redoubled. And therein perhaps lies the surest proof of the ultimate failure of Bolshevism. For to the peoples of Western Europe, whether they are conscious of it or not, Christianity is still the beacon that will guide them out of the slough of despond in which they now groan. If that light were extinguished, they might well say of the world what Montaigne thought of it

when he lost his friend: "*Ce n'est que fumée, ce n'est qu'une nuit obscuré et ennuyeuse.*" Do the Bolsheviks honestly believe that they can conquer two worlds?

APPENDIX A

To the Editor of the "Morning Post"

"SIR,—Will you allow me to add another link to the very valuable chain of evidence set forth in your columns on the question of Secret Societies and World Revolution? This is the organization known as the Alta Vendita or Haute Vente Romaine, which originated with the Carbonari early in the nineteenth century. Monseigneur Dillon, in his remarkable series of lectures delivered in Edinburgh in 1884, traced the origin of the Carbonari back to the Illuminati of Bavaria. The Carbonari, however, did not begin as a revolutionary body; its founders were Royalists and Catholics who, deluded as to the real aims of Illuminism, followed the precedent laid down by Weishaupt of taking Christ as their Grand Master. But before long the adepts of revolutionary masonry invaded their ranks and obtained the mastery over the whole association.

"As soon as, perhaps sooner than, Weishaupt had passed away, the supreme government of all the secret societies of the world was exercised by the Alta Vendita or highest lodge of the Italian

Carbonari. . . . The permanent instruction of this body to its adepts consists mainly in war on the papacy, but it also admits: 'Our final end is that of Voltaire and the French Revolution, the destruction of Catholicism, and even of the Christian idea.'"

The Alta Vendita was thus a direct continuation of the Illuminati, and in accordance with the custom of their German predecessors, its members all elected to be known by pseudonyms. Thus as Weishaupt had taken the name of Spartacus, Clootz that of Anacharsis, and Babeuf that of Gracchus, the head of the Order, a corrupt Italian nobleman, is only known to us as Nubius. This young man, rich, handsome, eloquent, and absolutely reckless, was "a visionary with an *idée fixe*, that of elevating a pedestal to his own vanity." But it was not in the band of dissolute young Italians he gathered around him, but in his Jewish allies that Nubius found his principal support.

The documents of the Alta Vendita, afterwards brought to light, revealed, says Monseigneur Dillon, that:

"his funds for carrying on the deep and dark conspiracy in which he and his confederates were engaged came chiefly from rich German Jews.

Jews, in fact, from the commencement played always a prominent part in the conspiracies of Atheism. They do so still. Piccolo Tigre, who seems to have been the most active agent of Nubius, was a Jew. He travelled under the appearance of an itinerant banker and jeweller. This character of money-lender disarmed suspicion. . . . Of course he had the protection of the Masonic lodges everywhere. The most desperate revolutionaries were generally the most desperate scoundrels, otherwise they were gamblers, spendthrifts, and the very class with which a usurious Jew would be expected to have money dealings. Piccolo Tigre thus travelled safely and brought safely to the lodges of the Carbonari such instructions as the Alta Vendita thought proper to give."

Piccolo Tigre was only one of many Jews employed by the Haute Vente; others of his race worked for the conspiracy in Germany, Hungary, Portugal, and kept up a regular correspondence with Nubius. How far were these men acting merely as the agents of their Italian chief? Or were they animated by some ulterior aim? The author of the articles now appearing in the *Morning Post* has indicated the possibility of a Jewish conspiracy running through Freemasonry, and Monseigneur Dillon propounds the same hypothesis.

"Monseigneur de Ségur," he writes, "connects modern Freemasonry with Jews and Templars. . . . There are reasons which lead me to think he may be right in doing so. The Jews for many centuries before the Reformation had formed secret societies for their protection and the destruction of Christianity which persecuted them and which they so much hated. The rebuilding of the Temple of Solomon was the dream of their lives. . . . It is therefore not improbable that they admitted into their secret conclaves some at least of the discontented Templars burning for revenge upon those who dispossessed and suppressed the Order. That fact would account for the curious combination of Jewish and conventional allusions to be found in modern Masonry. . . .

"The Jewish formulas employed by Masonry, the Jewish traditions which run through its ceremonial, point to a Jewish origin or to the work of Jewish contrivers. It is easy to conceive how such a society could be thought necessary to protect them from Christianity in power. It is easy also to understand how the one darling object of their lives is the rebuilding of the Temple. Who knows but behind the Atheism and desire of gain which impels them to urge on Christians to persecute the Church and destroy it, there lies a hidden hope to reconstruct their Temple, and at the darkest depths of secret-society plotting, there lurks a deeper society still which looks to a return to the

land of Juda and to the rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem!"

Whether, therefore, as M. Crétineau Joly suggests, Nubius made use of Judaic hatred of Christianity for the purpose of the Haute Vente, or whether the Jews made use of the Haute Vente to further their own cause, it cannot be denied that Jews played an important part in secret societies at this period. Piccolo Tigre at any rate seems to have occupied a position of considerable authority, for on January 18, 1822, we find him issuing instructions to the Haute Vente Piedmontaise in these words:

"All Italy is covered with religious confraternities and with penitents of diverse colours. Do not fear to slip some of your people into the very midst of these flocks, led, as they are, by a stupid devotion. . . . Gather together in one place or another—in the sacristies or chapels even—these tribes of yours, as yet ignorant; put them under the pastoral staff of some virtuous priest, well-known but credulous, and easy to be deceived. Then infiltrate the poison into those chosen hearts; infiltrate it in little doses and as if by chance. Afterwards, upon reflection, you will yourselves be astonished at your success.

"The essential thing is to isolate a man from his family, to cause him to lose his morals. He is sufficiently disposed by the bent of his character to flee from household cares and to run after easy pleasures and forbidden joys. He likes long talks in the *cafés*, the idleness of spectacles. Lead him along, sustain him, give him an importance of some kind, teach him discreetly to weary of his daily labours, and by this manœuvre, after having separated him from his wife and children, and having shown him how painful are all duties, you will inculcate in him the desire of another existence. Man is a born rebel. Stir up the desire of rebellion until it becomes a conflagration, but in such a manner that the conflagration does not break out. This is a preparation for the great work that you have to begin.

"When you have insinuated into a few souls disgust for family and for religion (the one nearly always follows in the wake of the other), let fall certain words which will provoke the desire of being affiliated to the nearest lodge. This vanity of the citizen or of the *bourgeois* for being enrolled in Freemasonry is something so *banal* and so universal that I am always full of admiration for human stupidity. I am not surprised to see the whole world knocking at the door of all the Venerables and asking these gentlemen for the honour of being one of the workmen chosen for the reconstruction of the Temple of Solomon. . . . To

find yourself a member of a lodge, to feel yourself, apart from your wife and children, called upon to guard a secret which is never confided to you, is for certain natures a delight and an ambition. . . . It is upon the lodges that we count to double our ranks. They form without knowing it our preparatory novitiate. They discourse without end upon the dangers of fanaticism, upon the happiness of social equality, and upon the grand principles of religious liberty. They launch amidst their feastings thundering anathemas against intolerance and persecution. This is positively more than we require to make adepts."

It was thus that in 1822 as in 1789 the conspirators found their dupes in the ranks of Masonry but, as Monseigneur Dillon points out:

"beyond the Masons, though generally formed from them, lay the deadly secret conclave which . . . used and directed them for the ruin of the world and their own selves."

This, then, was the secret force at work beneath the surface during the period usually represented to us as the dawn of Socialism. Many of the men who have gone down to history as the early Socialists, "champions of liberty," and so forth, went to the Haute Vente for guidance; Saint

Simon, Bazard, Buonarotti consulted Nubius "after the manner of a Delphic oracle." From Russia Colonel Oestel, one of the principal leaders of the Dekabrist outbreak in 1825, sent to him for orders. Later we find Mazzini, already a Carbonaro, aspiring to become a member of the Haute Vente—a suggestion dismissed with scorn by Nubius. For the methods of the Carbonari were not those of the Haute Vente, which held that the mind rather than the body should be the point of attack.

"The murders of which our people render themselves guilty . . ." writes Vindex to Nubius, "are for us a shame and a remorse . . . we are too advanced to content ourselves with such means. . . . Our predecessors in Carbonarism did not understand their power. It is not in the blood of an isolated man or even of a traitor that it must be exercised; it is on the masses . . . do not let us make martyrs, but let us popularize vice in the multitudes. Let them breathe it in by their five senses, let them drink it, let them be saturated in it. . . . It is corruption *en masse* that we have undertaken; the corruption of the people by the clergy and the corruption of the clergy by ourselves, the corruption that ought one day to put the Church in her tomb. The best dagger with which

to strike the Church is corruption. To the work, then, even to the very end."

It was thus that Mazzini excited the derision of the Haute Vente, for, as Nubius observed to Beppo, all his declamations on humanitarianism, and so on—

"reduce themselves to a few miserable defeats or to assassinations so vulgar that I should send away one of my lacqueys if he permitted himself to get rid of one of my enemies by such shameful means. Mazzini is a demigod to fools by whom he tries to get himself proclaimed the prophet of fraternity. . . . In the sphere where he acts poor Joseph is only ridiculous; in order to be a complete wild beast he will always want for claws. He is the *bourgeois gentilhomme* of the secret societies."

Mazzini on his part suspected that secrets were being kept from him by the chiefs of the Haute Vente, and Malegari, assailed by the same fears, wrote from London to Dr. Breidenstein these significant words:

"We form an association of brothers in all points of the globe, we have desires and interests in common, we aim at the emancipation of humanity, we wish to break every kind of yoke, yet there is

one that is unseen, that can hardly be felt, yet that weighs on us. Whence comes it? Where is it? No one knows, or at least no one tells. The association is secret, even for us, the veterans of secret societies."

Here, then, we catch a glimpse of the mechanism of revolution—the Socialists and Anarchists like animated marionettes waving their arms, declaiming, and all the while pulled by wires from behind, held in the hands of their sinister directors. Doubtless the Socialists imagined that they made the revolution of 1848. Piccolo Tigre can enlighten us further on this point. On January 5, 1846, he writes to Nubius:

"The journey I have just accomplished in Europe has been as fortunate and as productive as I had hoped. Henceforth nothing remains but to put our hand to the task in order to reach the *dénouement* of the comedy. . . . The harvest I have reaped has been abundant . . . and if I can believe the news communicated to me here (at Livorno) we are approaching the epoch we so much desire. The fall of thrones is no longer a matter of doubt to me now that I have just studied the work of our societies in France, in Switzerland, in Germany, and as far as Russia. The assault

which in a few years, and perhaps even in a few months from now, will be made on the princes of the earth will bury them beneath the wreckage of their impotent armies and their decrepit thrones. . . . What have we asked in return for our labours and sacrifices? It is not a revolution in one country or another. That can always be managed if one wishes it. In order to kill the old world surely, we have held that we must stifle the Catholic and Christian germ, and you with the audacity of genius have offered yourself with the sling of a new David to hit on the head the pontifical Goliath."

Two years later the revolution broke out in Paris, and as every book of history will tell us, was openly directed by the secret societies. The connection between these underground conspiracies and the second great outbreak of world revolution is therefore not a matter of surmise but of historical fact.—Yours, etc.,

NESTA H. WEBSTER.

P.S.—The correspondence of the Haute Vente quoted above is taken from *L'Église Romaine en face de la Révolution*, by J. Crétineau Joly, who published them from the archives of the Haute Vente.

APPENDIX B

To the Editor of the "Morning Post"

SIR,—In the fifth article of the series "Behind the Red Curtain" the author states that Marx founded the International Working Men's Association. May I be allowed to point out that this is paying too much honour to Marx? The idea of an International coalition of labour originated with real workingmen animated by no desire for bloody revolution, and it was not until after the famous meeting at St. Martin's Hall that Marx obtained control of the movement. On this point we have the evidence of James Guillaume, the chronicler of the Association, who was intimately acquainted with its workings. "It is not true," he writes, "that the *Internationale* was the creation of Karl Marx. He remained completely outside the preparatory work that took place from 1862 to 1864. He joined the *Internationale* at the moment when the initiative of the English and French workmen had just created it. Like the cuckoo, he came and laid his egg in a nest which was not his. His plan from the first day was to make the great workingmen's organization the instrument of his personal views." (*Karl Marx, Pan-Germaniste,*

p. 2.) What were these views? According to M. Guillaume they were Pan-Germanist, and your correspondent has clearly indicated the support given by Marx to German Imperialism. But he also goes on to inquire whether Jewish interests may not have played a part in Marx's policy, and in this connection refers to the feud between Marx and Bakunin. "Can it be," he asks, "that the fight between Socialist and Anarchist veiled and covered another fight more fierce and instinctive—between Slav and Jew?" Now we know that Bakunin was strongly anti-German, and that it was the Germanism of Imperial Russia which inspired many of his diatribes against its government. It might therefore have been on this account that he incurred the hostility of Marx. His attitude towards the Jews, however, is clearly defined in a significant passage. The letter in which this may be found is not included in Bakunin's correspondence, and was only published for the first time in 1911, so that I think it may have escaped the attention of your correspondent. It appears that Bakunin had been attacked in the Paris paper, *Le Réveil*, by a German Jew named Maurice Hess, and it was in reply to this that he wrote his *polémique contre les juifs* in October, 1869. But Bakunin had evidently not overestimated the power of the "formidable sect" to which he referred, for his letter never saw the light until unearthed by the publishers of his works forty-

two years later. This is the passage to which I refer:

"I begin by begging you to believe that I am in no way the enemy nor the detractor of the Jews. Although I may be considered a cannibal, I do not carry savagery to that point, and I assure you that in my eyes all nations have their worth. Each is, moreover, an ethnographically historic product, and is consequently responsible neither for its faults nor its merits. It is thus that we may observe in connection with the modern Jews that their nature lends itself little to frank Socialism. Their history, long before the Christian era, implanted in them an essentially mercantile and *bourgeois* tendency, with the result that, considered as a nation, they are *par excellence* the exploiters of other men's work, and they have a natural horror and fear of the popular masses, whom they despise moreover, whether openly or in secret. The habit of exploitation, whilst developing the intelligence of the exploiters, gives it an exclusive and disastrous bent and quite contrary to the interests as well as to the instincts of the proletariat. I know that in expressing with this frankness my intimate opinion on the Jews I expose myself to enormous dangers. Many people share it, but very few dare publicly to express it, for the Jewish sect, very much more formidable than that of the Jesuits, Catholic or Protestant, constitutes today a verita-

ble power in Europe. It reigns despotically in commerce, in the banks, and it has invaded three quarters of German journalism and a very con siderable portion of the journalism of other countries. Woe, then, to him who has the clumsiness to displease it!"

In these words Bakunin expresses a profound truth. Few, if any, educated Jews believe in Socialism. To say this is merely to pay a tribute to their intelligence. The Jew is essentially aristocratic in his outlook—that is to say, he believes in government by the best men; he knows the impossibility of mob rule, and he has learnt the lesson of past revolutions as we, alas! have never learnt them. It is therefore probable that Marx never believed a word he wrote on the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and the other shibboleths he had filched from earlier revolutionary writers and which he used to stir up the workers of whom he made his tools. It is true that in the above quoted letter Bakunin specifies only "the crowd of Jewish pygmies" as the exploiters of the people and exempts from his strictures "the two Jewish giants, Marx and Lassalle." But Bakunin did not yet know Marx. It was not until three years later, when the clique he refers to as "the German Jew company" had turned him out of the *Internationale*

that he dimly realized the depths of Marx's perfidy. In the words he then wrote we see how completely he had been the dupe of this subtler brain. After paying tribute to Marx's intellect, Bakunin goes on to say:

"There was never any frank intimacy between us. Our temperaments did not permit of it. He called me a sentimental idealist, and he was right; I called him vain, perfidious, and crafty, and I was right too." Although Bakunin still endeavours to believe in Marx's entire devotion to the cause of the proletariat which "he never betrayed knowingly," he is obliged nevertheless to add, "yet he compromises it immensely today by his formidable vanity, by his malignant character, and by his tendency to dictatorship even in the midst of the revolutionary Socialist Party."

Whether, therefore, Marx was an agent of the German Government or of the "formidable sect" referred to by Bakunin, he was certainly never the representative of the workers who had started the *Internationale.* It was Marx and not the workers who triumphed. The *Internationale* perished, but Marx's programme survived, and has since then been carried out "according to plan." The Russian Revolution was not the outcome of the

Russian revolutionary movement, of which the principal leaders were throughout the Anarchists, disciples of Bakunin, on whom the Bolsheviks turned their machine guns at the outset of their reign. The Irish Revolution now in progress is not the result of the Irish national movement; Sinn Fein is merely the tool of the International organization for carrying out the plan laid down by Marx. As long ago as 1870 this secret message was sent by Marx from London to the *Internationale* in Geneva:

1. *England is the only country in which a real Socialistic revolution can be made.*

2. *The English people cannot make this revolution.*

3. *Foreigners must make it for them.*

4. *The foreign members, therefore, must retain their seats at the London board.*

5. *The point to strike at first is Ireland, and in Ireland they are ready to begin their work.*

This is what is happening today. The chaos now reigning in Ireland is simply the prelude to the same condition of affairs in this country. To cause revolution in England is the first and most essential point in the programme of the International revolutionaries. "Every revolution on the Continent," said Marx, "that does not spread to

England is a storm in a teacup." In other words, England is the pivot of the world's civilization. If England goes the whole world goes with her. Marx was right in his surmise; he was right, too, in believing that English workingmen will never make this revolution. "Foreigners must make it for them." They are making it now. Shall we allow them to accomplish their work?

It seems to me, then, that the situation resolves itself into this. An immense revolutionary machine exists, and has long existed, but now all the parts have been perfected, every cog is complete. Your correspondent has admirably described the process of its construction. Yet I do not think it can be ascribed to one race only; many hands have worked—French, Italian, Russian, very few English, but many German and Jewish—and all these in turn have taken part in its manipulation. But from 1872 onwards, this formidable engine of destruction has been mainly in the hands of a section of Germans and Jews, and it is they who now control its workings. The essential thing therefore is not merely to indicate the mechanicians, but to smash the machine in the interests of the whole human race. For this machine will destroy not only those against whom it is directed, but those

by whom it is handled; no provision has been made for the recoil, and "the iron battalions of the proletariat," finding themselves duped, will turn in fury on the men who drove them forward to destruction. In warning the world of the conspiracy at work, the *Morning Post* is rendering an immense service to civilization, and those who turn a deaf ear may live to repent their folly when they find themselves engulfed in the general chaos of world revolution.—Yours, etc.,

NESTA H. WEBSTER.

July 17th.